

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

---

NOVEMBER, 1867.

---

ART. I. — FRANCES POWER COBBE.

*An Essay on Intuitive Morals: being an Attempt to Popularize Ethical Science.* First American edition, with additions and corrections by the Author. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co., 117, Washington Street; 1859.

*Religious Duty.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Boston: William V. Spencer, 203, Washington Street; 1865.

*The Cities of the Past.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. London: Trübner & Co., 60, Paternoster Row; 1864.

*Broken Lights: an Inquiry into the Present Condition and Future Prospects of Religious Faith.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Boston: J. E. Tilton & Co.; 1864.

*Italics.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. London: Trübner & Co., 60, Paternoster Row; 1864.

*Studies, New and Old, of Ethical and Social Subjects.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Boston: William V. Spencer; 1866.

*Hours of Work and Play.* By FRANCES POWER COBBE. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.; 1867.

JUDGED "as mere work, — not as mere woman's work," the volumes above named must claim a goodly share of interest and sympathy from every thoughtful man. They embrace in their treatment a wide range of subjects, — subjects of vast importance, which, as such, have enlisted the attention of multitudes of earnest people on both sides of the Atlantic, during

the last few years. They are at least the record of a faithful and vigorous attempt to solve some of the weightiest problems of the time,—problems that press upon us just in proportion as we are alive to the significance of the motion and upheaval that is everywhere apparent in matters of theology and faith. The smallest contribution to the solution of these problems will be highly valued by all those who are engaged in sounding them. So large a contribution as is presented in these volumes must waken admiration for their author in no small degree,—admiration that will deepen into love when all that she has done and tried to do is better known; when to our knowledge of the author we can add acquaintance with a woman who deserves to rank among the noblest of her time. Such acquaintance can be gathered largely from a comprehensive view of all that she has written. From first to last, her many-sided life has found a fair expression in her books. But one need not go outside of them to be aware that she has never yet attained to perfect utterance. We read between the lines the story of a woman, of whom the authoress is but a fragment, after all. And what we read in this way is abundantly confirmed by all whose pleasure it has been to make her personal acquaintance.

Frances Power Cobbe was born in Dublin, in the autumn of 1822. Her future leader and inspirer, Theodore Parker, was at that time a boy of twelve, wonderfully studious, making the most of the Latin dictionary he had purchased with the proceeds of his huckleberries, the August previous,—the first-ling of that flock of books he shepherded so well. We fancied once that we discovered in her books a certain Celtic warmth and fire. The fact is, that she is not of Celtic origin,—a fact to which her yellow Saxon locks bear witness as emphatically as the parish register. Her father, Charles Cobbe, had good estates in the vicinity of Dublin, descended to him from a great-grandfather, Charles Cobbe, Archbishop of Dublin, the first of the family who came to Ireland. Were one's ancestry a thing to boast of, Miss Cobbe could trace hers back, by several lines, to the time of Edward I., with a great deal of satisfaction. Nor is she by any means the first radical of her



house: for one of her ancestors was a knight in Cromwell's parliament; and another — father-in-law of the knight — was one of the judges of Charles I. Her mother was an English-woman, Conway by name. Frances was the youngest of five children; the rest were all boys, the eldest of whom, Charles, is now, of course, — his parents being dead, — owner of the family estates. This high-born maiden had to pay the penalties of rank, not the least heavy of which was to be educated by governesses until she was fourteen, and afterward to spend a year or two at a fashionable school at Brighton; learning French, German, and Italian in a style that no Frenchman, German, or Italian could ever comprehend, and to play on the harp and piano after a fashion not the most perfect. Had she been *spoilable*, this treatment would have spoiled her to perfection; but a genuine nature is not spoiled so easily. By degrees she woke to the conviction, that she was utterly and absolutely ignorant of every thing in the world that could really be called knowledge; and so went to work heroically, and spent the next ten years in trying to make up this deficiency, — partly with the help of an old Dublin-College tutor, who let her into Plato's Greek a little, and gave her a fair bit of geometry. Religiously, she was taught by her parents a moderate form of evangelical Christianity, — not Calvinism, as one might argue from the energy with which she battles with it, as often as it crosses her path, in her "Intuitive Morals" and "Religious Duty." All her people belonged to the Church of England. Such a thing as dissent had never been known in the family.

Her people were steadily religious people, after the fashion of the English Church. From her earliest years, Frances seems to have been very sensitive to religious impressions, and soon became dimly conscious, that they were sources to her of different feelings than the dutiful attention she saw others give them. Left much to herself by the necessities of her position as the only daughter of the house, robbed by her mother's sickness of the great benefits of her society, she had ample time for meditation, — time which she did not fail to improve. The Bible and the "Pilgrim's Progress" peopled

the vast rooms of the grand old house with saintly and angelic company. Anon the child's brain exercised itself over "The Whole Duty of Man,"—not just the sort of food a child's brain generally needs, but in this case not failing of digestion; making some nutriment that did not come amiss in after years, when from that brain another and far better theory of duty sprang, full armed. Doubts, too, she had—what child that thinks at all does not have them?—about the miracles: the feeding of the five thousand, and subsequent filling of the baskets, was especially a nut that she desired to crack, but could not, and only hurt herself in trying. The reader may have noticed, that no nuts are so hard to crack as those which have nothing in them.

Miss Cobbe is sometimes spoken of as if she were merely a follower of Theodore Parker,—a sort of spiritual valet to that hero in the lists of thought. But, had this been her relation to him, she would not have understood him,—would not have been, as she has been thus far, the best of his interpreters. For, as Hegel has well told us, it is not the hero's but the valet's fault that the former does not seem heroic to the latter. It takes a hero to comprehend a hero. Miss Cobbe is not a mere follower of Parker, but a contemporary growth, and for this very reason she has comprehended him so well,—or rather apprehended him; for who, as yet, has *comprehended* the breadth and altitude of that great-hearted man? Miss Cobbe became a Theist, before knowing any thing of Parker's views,—in fact, before they had been definitely shaped in his own mind. Four years of alternate scepticism and violent returns to Christianity had left her terribly exhausted by the struggle, when, one day in spring, as she was dreaming over her favorite Shelley, it came into her to say to herself, that, though she knew nothing of God or heaven, or any law beyond that of her own soul, she would be true to that,—she would deserve her own esteem; and this resolution brought, almost immediately, by its own power as it were, a fresh kind of faith in God,—a sense that, somehow, such an effort must be pleasing to her Creator, who had given that inner law. From that hour she was a Theist; though, at the time, she felt her-

self alone in all the world. But no one likes to be the sole possessor of a glorious thought; and so she went about among the Deists of the eighteenth century,—Tindal, Collins, Gibbon, Hume, Voltaire (writers with whom Dr. Miner, in his recent bull against all heretics, delights to class the Theists of to-day),—but of course discovered that Deism and Theism are two very different things; as different as levelling down and levelling up. But in the “*Life of Blanco White*” she found a spirit kindred with her own; and, best of all, reading in the “*Athenæum*” a critique on Parker’s “*Discourse*,” she sent for it and read it, with what joy need not be told. It was not long after that her mother’s death opened up to her, in all its depth, the question of the future life; and she wrote to Parker, asking him why he believed in immortality. His “*Sermon of the Immortal Life*,” which has been food to many a hungry soul, was his reply; written, no doubt, as the best sermons always are, in answer to some crying need.

\* The ten years after her mother’s death were years of solitary work. How wide her reading must have been during these years, her books bear witness, especially the richly-laden notes that crowd the foot of almost every page. In these years, “*Intuitive Morals*” and “*Religious Duty*” were both written, though not published at once. Meanwhile, her definite rupture with the Church had taken place; and how hard it must have been for her and all concerned, the readers of her article in the July “*Examiner*” can imagine for themselves. Of the mantle of charity which she there so generously spreads over the conduct of others, she needs no corner for herself. She chose at once the most direct and obvious method of delivering her own soul from the net of a most difficult and complicated position. But it was not as if she could not feel as well as think. The grand old Church that cherished her ancestors’ names and virtues on its walls, their sacred dust in its mysterious vaults, must have possessed strange charms for one so sensitive to such impressions. But they were not strong enough to shake the steadfast purpose of her soul.

About ten years ago, her father died; and soon after, bidding farewell to her old home, she went to Italy, and remained there

several months. The best result of this visit, and of one subsequent,—after her own mental growth and spiritual rejuvenation,—was her “*Italics* ;” a most delightful and instructive book, which has never been republished in America, and is but little known here, except by her best friends. The time for its republication is now past ; for it was largely occasioned by the events current at the time when it was written. Much that was then prophetic is now sober fact. Venice has already freed herself from the iron clutch of her oppressor, and the days of the Pope’s temporal jurisdiction are much fewer and feebler than they were then ; but the book is still worth perusing, if any one can get it in its handsome English dress. The last chapters, especially, are a better revelation of Miss Cobbe, upon her social side, than can be elsewhere found in any of her books. Here, too, we find a fondness for statistics, that reminds one of the passion Parker had in the same line. The practical turn of mind, which, in the life she had been living, had been able to assert itself only in very limited ways, such as housekeeping and visits to the poor and sick, now found an ample field in an attempt to estimate the various forces that were so thoroughly at work in the regeneration of Italy. We took great pleasure in the book ; and regret sincerely that it is not now at hand, that we might indicate more carefully the scope and style of its contents.

Returning from Italy, Miss Cobbe became a fellow-laborer with Mary Carpenter, in her self-sacrificing efforts to save the characters of young outcast girls, in the Red-House-Lodge Reformatory, and remained there a year. An accident, resulting in a serious and painful lameness, terminated this connection. But, even without this decided hint, it is more than probable that she would not have remained there very long. For, with all honor to her earnestness and devotion, it can scarcely be denied, that, for once, she was upon a false scent,—that she was working in a direction parallel to her genius, not in the very line of it. *Non omnia possumus omnes*, the Latin poet says ; and it is no discredit to us, if we can do one thing well, that we cannot do another. Who thinks any less of Hazlitt because he could not paint, seeing that he could write



so gracefully; or of Goethe, because, with all his trying, he could do nothing creditable in plastic art? But as neither Hazlitt's effort nor Goethe's was by any means wasted, but furthered their self-knowledge and their growth, so with Miss Cobbe's attempt at practical philanthropy. It was not much of a success. Though not without executive ability, she had not exactly the right sort to fit her for the work which came so natural to Mary Carpenter. The spirit was willing, but the nerves were rather weak. We do not regret it. There is enough for her to do, without trying doubtful ventures. But the pain which those poor girls occasioned her, by their coarse and brutal ways, turned into inspiration when she took her pen and tried to rouse her fellow-countrymen to a sense of their most pressing duty to the poor and lost. Had she remained in the school at Bristol a dozen years, she would have accomplished less than she has since achieved through her various writings on subjects growing out of her experience while there. The most influential of these writings was her pamphlet on "Friendless Girls," on the spur of which several new missions were established. But the leading idea of this pamphlet is credited by Miss Cobbe to a Miss Stephens. Her article on "The Philosophy of the Poor Laws," published in "Fraser," September, 1864, and now in the volume of collected articles entitled "Studies, Ethical and Social," is a fearful commentary on the workhouse system, as it exists in England at the present time,—the jumbling together of men and women, young and old, crazy and sane, sick and well, deaf, dumb, and blind, pure and debauched. For all these terrible mistakes, that convert what should be nurseries of health and comfort into dens of misery and sin, her quick eye sees the remedy, and her voice is eloquent to plead for the destruction of the long abuse. Her other papers of like import are "The Sick in Workhouses," "The Workhouse as a Hospital,"—two papers that record the results of her own observations,—and a paper on "The Indigent Classes," which the reader will find in her last volume of collected articles, entitled "Hours of Work and Play." The limitation of this article is, that it is too patronizing in its tone, speaking too

much of how we shall work *for* the indigent, and not enough of how we may work *with* them. Better than to spend all our time in finding out how poverty and its attendant evils can be *cured*, is it to spend a part of it in asking what will *prevent* these curses and these crimes. Five minutes spent in hacking at the root of a great evil avails more than sixty spent in tearing off its branches and its poisoned fruits. Let us first see to it, that the laboring man has a fair chance, and incidentally we shall nip in the bud a thousand of the evils that attend him. Not patronage, but justice, is the word which shall exorcise from the weary soul of labor the many devils that possess it. But, until justice is attained, honor, thrice honor, to those who do their best to cure the evils that ought never to exist!

During the spring of 1860, Miss Cobbe was again in Italy, and arrived at Florence just in time to see Theodore Parker slipping his earthly moorings, and launching out into that deep which had for him no fears. It must have been a real pleasure to the dying man to meet thus, even at the parting of the ways, the woman who had watched his star in the East so long, and now had come to worship him. Very faithfully had it pointed to the Christ-child in her heart; and, since it lost itself in heaven, very faithfully has she kept the altar of his memory aflame. Her edition of his works is much better than any published in America,—to the shame of somebody be it said; and doubtless it would have been still better, had she received all the help that she had a right to expect from those best able to assist her. Since Parker's death, no one has done more to perpetuate his influence and increase his fame.

It was during her first absence from England, that Miss Cobbe's travels were extended to the East, enabling her to write one of the most charming books of travel that it has ever been our lot to read. We refer to her "Cities of the Past." These cities of the past are Baalbec, Cairo, Rome, Jericho, Athens, and Jerusalem. It seems to us that these chapters contain a more complete report of Miss Cobbe's whole nature, body and soul, than any single book that she

has written, or than all the rest of them together. Not but that certain phases of that nature are elsewhere more fully revealed; as, for example, the most striking phase of all, which her "Intuitive Morals" and "Religious Duty" represent. But that profound ethical element, the primitive granite of her nature, is everywhere cropping out through the deposits with which wit and fancy and imagination have for the moment sought to cover this original base. Everywhere she finds glorious confirmations of the faith that is in her. The ruins of Baalbec and the pyramids of Egypt are voiceful with that psalm of life which her own heart is singing to her, day and night; even the waters of the Dead Sea murmur it to her soul. This is the confirmation that her sturdy naturalism found in Alexandria:—

"A little out of the modern city, under the hill on which stands Diocletian's column (miscalled of Pompey), there was disinterred, just before my arrival, a very interesting relic, — an early Christian church, hewn in the tufa-like substance of the hill, and closed up, no doubt, for sixteen or eighteen centuries. The frescoes were quite vivid when I saw them. No doubt could exist that they belonged to a very early date; for, though rude enough, there was no trace of the Byzantine poverty of style, but, on the contrary, precisely the broad, bold outlines of the frescoes from Herculaneum and Pompeii I had just seen in the Museo Borbonico. One of these was especially interesting. It was a full-length, life-size picture of Christ, so different from our received ideas of his appearance, that I should not have guessed it was meant for him, save for the word 'Christos,' in Greek, written over the head. It represented a powerful, dark man, with masses of black hair, cut short over his ears. The attitude was dignified and commanding, without that peculiar tenderness and sadness usually expressed by the droop of the head, so singularly antedated by the great bronze bust of Plato found in Herculaneum. It is idle to make or mar theories, from a single instance of very uncertain date; yet it does appear to me, that this fresco deserves to be taken *per contra* the very interesting researches lately published in the 'Art-Union Journal.' A very ancient church has certainly here commemorated an idea wholly opposed to our later one. And, at a period which cannot be much earlier, we find that the *modern* conception of Christ's head was then attributed (almost without a variation) to the great philosopher of the Academy!" — *Cities of the Past*, p. 39.

But, though Miss Cobbe is pledged, by the title of her book, to tell us something of the cities of the past, she does not mope among their ruins all the time; her transitions to the cities of the present are made easily and rapidly enough. The monuments of ancient art and civilization interest her far less than the men and women of to-day. Everywhere it is humanity that interests her; and not merely humanity in the abstract, but its living impersonations. Would that we had many more such travellers! Then, if we knew a little less about palaces and cathedrals, we should know a great deal more about the men who live in their shadows, and whose lives are the main thing to be considered. What national differences lurk beneath this story of her fellow-travellers, among whom were several nuns!

"Two of them, who were French ladies, held animated arguments with the third, a little, warm-hearted German *fraulein*, who had another set of legends of her own, and would sometimes venture to dispute the accuracy of theirs; as, for instance, that no one, except Christ, was ever exactly six feet high! One day, one of the French nuns very solemnly told me, that, if anybody rose at sunrise on Trinity Sunday, he would see '*toutes les trois personnes de la Sainte Trinité*.' — 'Of course, madame, you have done so yourself?' I observed. '*Pas précisément, madame*, — madame would observe how early the sun rose at that season. But it was true, *parfaitement vrai*.' The little German seemed in profound thought for a time, and then said, with the conscious audacity of a Strauss, '*Je ne le crois pas*.'"

The chapter about Rome is deeply interesting, and wonderfully significant in its bearing on the present attitude of the Roman people in their relations with the priests. It is a forcible comparison between the Carnival as it was, only a few years ago, and the dreary, soulless farce into which it has now degenerated. For a few hundreds in the Corso, where the Carnival was once so glorious, there were twenty thousand in the Forum, summoned there, in defiance of the Papal Government, by the National Committee of Rome, who closed their proclamation to the people with the words, "Viva the Pontiff, not the King! Viva Vittorio Emanuele, King of Italy!" And here is the summing-up of the whole matter:—



"It happened to us once to attend the examination of an infant-school, conducted by ladies more benevolent in purpose than sagacious in the science of managing small children. Several hours were spent in desultory inquiries, repetitions of lessons, and investigation of copy-books. Finally, the time for dinner arrived, while the children were singing the third or fourth of a collection of somewhat lugubrious although edifying hymns.

"At this crisis, the attendants brought into the school-room the trays covered with the bread and soup, and of course all eyes were instantly fixed in their direction, with longing aspirations. Having once been a child myself (a claim which, I observe, is always stated as peculiar and remarkable), I ventured to whisper, that the three remaining verses might be dispensed with, and more interesting researches pursued than that of the abstract question,—

‘Why should I deprive my neighbor  
Of his goods against his will?’

But I was wrong. Hymns must be finished, and children taught to restrain unruly appetites; and so another and another verse was sung, slower and slower, and lower and lower, as the little voices dropped out of the chorus in weariness, or were fascinated into silence by the spectacle of the dinner. At last it ended; but there was to be another song, and this was to be something more diverting and delightful. The dear children liked it so much! It was a species of parody on ‘Nid-noddin;’ and at each verse the singers appeared actively engaged in humming, digging, washing, or reading, repeating in chorus,—

‘And we’re all washing, wash, wash, washing,  
We’re all washing, so happy and so gay.’

Or,—

‘We’re all spelling, spell, spell, spelling,  
So happy and so gay.’

The first verse was got over passably. At the second, ‘so happy and so gay’ had become *pianissimo*. At the third, it was a whine; at the fourth, a wail. At the fifth, several little faces had tears running down them. Finally,—

‘So hap, happy and so g-a-a-y’—

ended in a regular roar of crying, of half the poor little babies, in chorus.

"It appears to me, that, at this moment, the Papal Government is treating its subjects much as we did those hungry children. It is say-

ing to them, 'Sing, my pretty dears; sing and play, and show your kind visitors that you are all "so happy and so gay." Don't look at the bread-basket just now; don't think whether you are tired of sitting in the stocks. Play away; sing your pretty songs. We'll lead you ourselves, —

' We're all playing, play, play, playing,  
We're all playing, so happy and so gay' " (pp. 71, 72).

Within the last few years, Miss Cobbe has given herself, when not prevented by ill-health, to steady literary work. But, for the most part, it is not to literature, as such, that she has given her time and energies, but to literature as a means of spreading her ideas of the truth and right. Thus far, she belongs not to the school of Erasmus, but to that of Luther. The religious instinct dominates, almost everywhere, over the literary. Substance is always held superior to form. We trust that it will always be so. Even if Miss Cobbe had in herself the material for a high literary reputation, we could more easily dispense with one more literary star, than we could get along without her voice crying in the wilderness of error and credulity, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." May the day never come when she will be satisfied with "beholding the bright countenance of truth in the still air of delightful studies," and be less earnest than she has thus far been to apply the truth she sees, — a sword-point in the side of every old abuse, — the flask of the Samaritan wherever there are honest wounds demanding to be healed! The largest piece of work which she has recently accomplished is her "Broken Lights," a book that had a cordial welcome from the "Examiner," on its first appearance, three or four years ago. It contains an admirable statement of the position of the various parties in the English Church and out of it, on English soil, with reference to the great central questions that are now agitating the religious world. The attitude of the High-Church and Low-Church Palæologians (as she calls those who seek to maintain the old faith at the expense of the new knowledge, in contradistinction from the Neologians, who seek to modify the old ideas into some sort of harmony with the results of criticism and science) she indicates with remarkable precision;

and the chances that their solution of the great problem will be accepted, and become the religion of the future, are weighed in the balances of her impartial thought, and found exceeding light and good for nothing. The Neologians, or Broad Churchmen, are divided into two parties: one led by Maurice and Kingsley, the other by Jowett and his fellow-writers in the "Essays and Reviews." Of these two parties, the first has tried to stretch the ancient dogma of the Bible and the Prayer-book on the Procrustes' bed of modern science, and fancies that this can be done successfully, and that it will never be necessary to lop off any superfluous extremity. But the practical working of this theory, though it has been stretched in many cases to the last gasp of absurdity, has been any thing but a uniform and flattering success. The great trick that this school relies upon is one, the object of which is to divert the student from criticism to edification. Of this trick, Kingsley's "Gospel of the Pentateuch"—one of the thousand-and-one replies, that answered nothing, to Colenso's arguments—is a complete example. The motto on its banner ought to be the well-known distich of the nursery,—

"Open your mouth and shut your eyes,  
And I'll give you something to make you wise."

But, alas! the nineteenth century much prefers to take its food with its eyes open.

The second Broad Church, that of the Essayists and Reviewers, does not agree with the first Broad Church, that the old dogma can be harmonized with the new science. It has stretched on its Procrustes' bed of iron fact the old traditions, and declares that they cannot in all cases be made to fit by any amount of stretching or contraction; that occasionally they will fall short, and that at other times something must be subtracted. It takes issue with the first Broad Church, which holds that the inspiration of the Bible differs *in kind* from that of all other books, holding that it only differs *in degree*; and this position cuts at once a thousand Gordian knots, that the fingers of no Bible-saving ingenuity have ever been able to untie. Why

may not this Church dictate the religion of the future? Because, like every other party in the Church, it would rest our faith on history. And though, "in this case, it is history *corroborated* by consciousness, not *opposed* thereto," under no conditions is it probable, argues Miss Cobbe, that history can furnish the ultimate sources of faith. *Consciousness illustrated and confirmed by history*, — on this rock would she place the corner-stone of her Theistic Church. To the elucidation and proof of this position she devotes the closing chapters of her book.

This book, which is worth a dozen of the "Ecce-Homo," and still more rash and ill-digested "Ecce-Deus," sort, though written primarily for Englishmen, deals unavoidably with questions that concern us all. He that hath ears to hear, let him hear this bit of admonition: —

"The Unitarians, while giving to him [God] alone the *name* of 'God,' and jealously reserving it and all acts of worship for him, have yet persisted in giving to Christ that position which practically to us, as moral beings, is a divine one, namely, that of our moral Lord and teacher, and future judge. This doctrine involves in itself the essential evil of Trinitarianism; nay, goes beyond it. It signifies exceedingly little to us, in a spiritual sense, whether more superhuman beings than One have a right to the title of 'God,' or what we think about the eternity or self-existence of the Deity. What *does* signify to us, spiritually, is the question, Who is *our moral Master*? To whom do we owe allegiance? Who has taught us (whether internally or externally) the law of duty? Whom do we obey or offend, as we regard or disregard that law? Who watches our obedience now? Who judges us now and for all eternity? These questions touch the very heart of religion. To present to our minds a second Lord, another Master, Teacher, Judge, destroys for us the whole *moral* value of the doctrine of the unity of God. Nay, with all respect, I would urge the question on Unitarians, whether they do not here fall into an error worse than that of the Trinitarian? If we are to believe in two moral Lords, — a great Lord and a lesser Lord; a king and his vicegerent, — is it not better to believe that these two are one and the same Lord? From this persistence in holding by the doctrine of the moral lordship of Christ, after they have rejected that Trinitarian hypothesis on which such a doctrine could be properly based, the Unitarians may surely



trace their small hold upon the minds of men, as compared with the claims they might otherwise justly make upon the largest sympathy. That one half-note wrong in their beautiful psalm seems to have made it lose all its reverberating power" (pp. 124, 125).

There are in this volume many points of interest upon which we cannot touch. Especially interesting is her review of Renan, with which we by no means wholly agree; and very noble, certainly, is her definition of the spiritual rank of Jesus: "He must surely have been *the man who best fulfilled all the conditions under which God grants his inspiration.*" But her talk of the regenerate and unregenerate smacks almost too strongly of the very same old bottles into which she has averred so stoutly that our new wine ought never to be poured, unless it is her justification that she has mixed enough of the old wine with the new to render any serious amount of fermentation quite impossible. And after all her trouble over the psychology of Mill, which resolves her *intuitions* into results of cerebral association, and all her dread of his utilitarian theory of morals, it must be quite refreshing to her to find him so energetically affirming\* her own central thought, "If God is good, he is good in our sense of the word;" and declaring, that, though utility is the *basis*, it is not the *motive*, of our moral action. Indeed, except in Miss Cobbe's own writings, we know not where to look for sterner rebukes of the "celestial prudence" of the popular theology, than abound in the writings of John Stuart Mill.

Not in the order of time, but in the order of significance, we now come to Miss Cobbe's greatest work, and that by which she is most widely known,—"*Intuitive Morals.*" But of this book it is not necessary that we should here say any thing special. It has been before the public several years; and very beautiful and blessed has its mission been. For many a struggling one beset with doubts, it has bridged a gulf that seemed impassable, and borne him over into "new, firm lands" of faith and joy. Its trumpet-tones have roused many a drowsy

---

\* Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy, vol. i.

soul from the long sleep of a traditional faith, to face-and-face communion with the highest truth. We well remember with what pleasure we were swept along by its majestic current, when we first launched upon it, several years ago; and how hard it was to check the almost irresistible impulse to write to the author, and inform her of our admiration for her book. At the time of its appearance, it was reviewed, at length, in the "Examiner;" and, from the praise there given, we cannot find it in our head, and much less in our heart, to subtract the smallest particle. And yet it is not for the most obvious characteristics of the book that we now value it most highly. It might be far less strong than it is in its opposition to sensational psychology and the doctrine of utility, and our total impression of the book would not be very different from what it now is. Miss Cobbe does well to insist, beforehand, that the value of her work does not depend on the correctness of her metaphysics. But sometimes she seems to forget this, and to speak as if the moral welfare of the race were staked on certain theories, which failing of acceptance, the reign of conscience would be over. Therefore it is that we are often led to wish that Miss Cobbe had developed the ideas contained in this book, after having seen more of the world, instead of in her solitude, before the rare experience of men and women which she afterward enjoyed, had deepened and enlarged her character, and *humanized* the various aspects of her thought. Hardly could any experience add much to her already rich and glowing consciousness of God or to her abstract faith in man. But, if we are not much mistaken, she has a great deal more faith in men and women now than she had ten years ago. A little more of this would have dispelled the fears which sometimes haunt her pages, — that virtue is at the mercy of our metaphysics. For ourselves, we believe that every thinker, thinking honestly, will add something to the truth, however hostile to our views of truth at any given time his theories may be. Let Bain and Mill and Spencer say their strongest word: if they are seeking for the truth, it will not lead them or their followers astray. We do not believe that any man has been made worse by sitting at the feet of these men, or ever will be, though their philoso-

phy is any thing but intuitive. Let their unwearying analysis go on ; and, in whatever direction it may carry them, it ought not to be doubted, that a grander synthesis will be the ultimate result. And, in the mean time, we are sure that every earnest moralist, untrammelled by tradition, will be in practical accord with every other. In given circumstances, Frances Power Cobbe and John Stuart Mill would act with a strange unanimity, considering that their theories of morals seem to be so far apart.

The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life ; and it is the spirit which pervades "*Intuitive Morals*" that impresses us most deeply with its worth. Of the main truth of its philosophy we are profoundly convinced, and believe that the most that cerebral psychology can do, with its magnificent array, is to force Spiritualism\* back on its reserves, strengthened by which it shall again sweep every thing before it. But the sublime unselfishness, that makes these pages radiantly beautiful, is quite independent of the philosophy which they set forth. "Do right for the right's sake ; love God and goodness because they are good," — this is the constantly-recurring admonition for which her book has been so highly prized. And in its practical bearings there is no philosophy that can break its force. And indeed there is no philosophy, independent of religion, that pretends to do this. It is only when religion of an unworthy type steals for a time the garment of philosophy, and with it tries to hide its naked ugliness, that "enlightened selfishness" is set forth as the highest rule of life. Against this rule, in all its shifting forms, the chapters of "*Intuitive Morals*" wage a continuous, unsparing, and successful war.

Not the least valuable portions of the book are those criticisms of current theological conceptions, which, for the most part, are introduced as notes, expanding and illustrating the body of the work. Our readers, for the most part, may have got so bravely over these conceptions, that they may not appreciate the force of the remarks by which they are here overthrown ; for, when they are once overthrown in one's own

---

\* Not *Spiritism*, which is the most materialistic movement of the age.

mind, it seems as if they ought to fall in other minds by their own weight. But it is very seldom that they do. The strongest arguments are oftener of no avail, else would there be no Calvinists upon the earth to-day ; for, logically, they have been routed more than a thousand times. But, when arguments can hope to avail any thing, these of Miss Cobbe's ought to be very mighty for the tearing down of strongholds where the various forms of orthodoxy are entrenched. Sooner or later, every distinctive doctrine of supernatural orthodoxy gets its deathblow at her hands. But orthodoxy has a great deal of that convenient ignorance which sometimes makes a general so successful in the field. It never knows when it is whipped.

The promise of "Intuitive Morals" was, that it should be followed by two other volumes, — one, dealing with the social and personal duties of man ; the other, with his duties towards God. Only the second half of this promise has been kept. The first half has been withdrawn. But what would have constituted a very important chapter in this part of her work, had it been written, has been worked up into one of the best essays in her "Studies, Ethical and Social," on "The Rights of Man and the Claims of Brutes," — an earnest and admirable discussion of a question that receives almost as little theoretical as practical consideration, and that is indeed very little. The fault of this essay, as of several others, is that it threatens never to get fairly under way. We are kept so long standing in the vestibule, that, when we are admitted to the house, we are in a better mood to criticise than to enjoy. And highly as we should prize a complete work from Miss Cobbe, on the great subject of which this essay forms a part, it is not as if Herbert Spencer had not written "Social Statics," the most popular of all his works, which opens with an onslaught on the "greatest-happiness" philosophy, which can hardly be surpassed in vigor and conclusiveness.

"Religious Duty" does not impress us as a book well calculated, upon the whole, to do the work for which it is designed ; *i.e.*, to make religious duty more abound. If any subject, from its very nature, demands a rich and flowing treatment, it is this ; but, unfortunately, it is just here that Miss Cobbe sinks



to the most prosaic level that she anywhere attains. Her style is nowhere else so hard and cold and unimaginative as in this treatise. The feeling we have always had concerning it is, that it was not shaped in the same mood in which it was conceived. The metal must have waited too long for the mould. For the substance of the book is far superior to its form; and this fact goes far to reconcile us to the hardness of the style. Creation, Henry James informs us, is giving body to a form; a queer notion, which seems less queer the more we think of modern literature, so much of which has form and nothing else. Better formless substance than unsubstantial form. The kernel of Miss Cobbe's book will pay the reader for his trouble with its tough and rather tasteless shell. It is full of excellent discriminations. Some of the words which she defines as "religious faults" or "offences" seem to us hardly worth saving. As the devil ought not to have all the best tunes, so ought he not to have all the best words; but the sooner that some go to him the better. The critical portion of this book is very skilfully done. With admirable precision, the writer sticks her pen into this or that time-consecrated bladder, and lets its airy nothingness escape; then loads the word or phrase thus ventilated with something solidier, and hurls it whence it came. By this process, a very deep and noble meaning is many times incorporated in a word before quite meaningless, or charged with meanings wholly bad. But the object of this book is less to clarify men's thoughts and definitions than to induce the sentiment of religious duty; and, to obtain this object, it does not impress us as being singularly well-fitted. For that, it is too critical and cold. For the main idea of the work,—viz., that our heavenly affections are rooted in morality,—we have nothing but sympathy. But it is in our personal and social morality that these affections have their root; and, when once this part of ethics has been duly enforced, our attitude to God can be better represented under the aspects of love and need, than under the sterner aspect of duty. Piety is the love of God; and, as such, it works from the centre, not from the circumference, of the soul. It is our duty to admire the sunset splendor and the rolling sea; but not much is gained by

insisting upon this. Develop our æsthetic faculty, and we cannot help admiring all such things. So, with the development of social virtue, the thought of God grows mighty in the soul; and henceforth the duties which we owe to him are swallowed up in joy, and become so many needs, not merely asking, but demanding, satisfaction.

Of some of the articles contained in "Studies, Ethical and Social" and "Hours of Work and Play," we have already spoken. They contain many papers of great interest, and some that show a keener sense of form than any of her other works. The first two papers in the "Studies" are, however, most directly in her line, and are the noblest which the volume contains. The first of these, especially, entitled "Christian Ethics and the Ethics of Christ," is thoroughly excellent. It seizes with great force the salient points of Christ's morality, and contrasts them very sharply with the conventional Christian ethics of to-day. This is the ground where she has always been, and always will be, most at home; and while we heartily rejoice, that, in her "hours of play," she can produce such pleasant papers as some that are contained in these two volumes, and would not have her narrow down such hours too carefully, yet, the more we think of it, the more convinced we are that she had better give her "hours of work" to ethical subjects, or such as are intimately connected therewith.

Miss Cobbe has been engaged for some time, until recently, in writing leaders for a daily paper which is owned by the Marquis of Westminster. And that she is still a monarchist in her theory of government, must be inferred from certain things that she has written. But, from her sympathy with us in our great struggle, it was pleasant to infer that she had otherwise complete faith in government "for the people, by the people," in her own land. Nor would we be too hasty in concluding that she has not; for the object of the paper which she edited is to apply intuitive morals to social rather than to political affairs. For the sake of her philosophy, we trust that she is all right in this matter; remembering, as we do, the rule of Jesus, that

"every tree is known by its fruits." If her doctrines lead to oligarchy, while those of Mill ultimate in democracy, we are in a fearful "strait betwixt two;" with no method of deliverance but to accept the premises of the one and the conclusions of the other, which can hardly be considered satisfactory.

In person, Miss Cobbe is large; her face full of expression; her brow very beautiful; her eyes luminous, rather than flashing; her mouth flexible, and quivering with wit, humor, and a power of sarcasm that seldom appears in her writings. She has immense animal spirits, as any reader of her "Cities of the Past" may know, and great physical courage. Her faith, that she was made for virtue rather than for happiness, does not prevent her from being herself thoroughly happy, and diffusing happiness through every circle that she blesses with her presence. Miss Alcott, in a well-meant but ill-judged letter to the "Independent," calls her "a great sunbeam," and says, "Wherever she was, people gathered about her as if she was a social fire; and every one seemed to find warmth and pleasure in the attractive circle that surrounded her. It was truly delightful to see a woman so useful, happy, wise, and beloved." She is eminently a magnetic person,—a very genial, suggestive, and exhilarating talker, without pedantry or fluent rattle. Possessed of marked facility for intercourse with every type of character, her sphere of influence is constantly enlarging. And this influence is of the very noblest sort, because she is a woman,—never so completely any thing else as she is that; never losing, in the sweep of her attainments, the peculiar charm that indicates her sex. And, more than any thing else in her,—

"The ever womanly draweth us on."

If she has reached, she surely has not passed, the zenith of her powers. In the course of nature, she has still many years for growth and work. God grant that she may tarry with us long! We do not care to argue the question, whether she has genius. The lack of any high imaginative quality in her thought may justly rob her of that claim. It may be only talent that she has; but it is talent so reverently cultivated,

so sincerely used, that we are not dissatisfied. But this distinction applies only to her writings. High above these rises the character,—the woman. Genius for character, genius for womanhood, she has; and, having this, her work is sure of being better done than if, without it, she had many times her present intellectual power.

---

#### ART. II.—YOUMANS ON MODERN CULTURE.

*The Culture Demanded by Modern Life.* E. L. YOUMANS. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1867.

IN editing this book, Dr. Youmans has earned the thanks of all who are interested in the mooted question of the true method of modern culture. The work consists of a series of addresses and arguments on the claims of scientific education. The names of Tyndall, Hefrey, Huxley, Faraday, De Morgan, Barnard, Carpenter, Spencer, and others, are a pledge, at the outset, of good matter within. The selection may, indeed, wear a somewhat partisan look; but it gives assurance, that one side of the question, at least, will be ably presented, and by men animated with earnest convictions. It is a great thing to have thus brought together, within the compass of a single volume, matter that one would have to hunt out at a considerable cost of time and money. Dr. Youmans has before this laid the reading world under obligation, by collecting in a similar manner, in his "Correlation of Forces," the best things that have been written on that fascinating subject in England and in Germany.

In the present work, however, he has not confined himself to the mere task of editing. Two of the ablest articles in the book are from his own pen. His Introduction is especially valuable. It would be hard to point out words that deserve to be more carefully pondered than his remarks on the importance of economizing power by repetition of mental action in the work of education, and of continuity in the



nature of the studies pursued. Few American readers of his words but will groan over the disjointed method—or rather absence of method—in which their own education was conducted. Mathematics, physics, chemistry, studied to the point where the brain was just beginning to acquire spontaneity and tenacity in dealing with them, and then these subjects suffered to lapse utterly out of the mind during a year or two of totally different occupation! One section of mental railroad hardly graded and ballasted for smooth running, when it was abandoned to be gullied by rains and torrents; instead of being kept in constant use for freighting easily the stone and gravel and trusswork needed for advancing farther and farther through the swamps and forests of the yet unsubdued country! One's chemistry or botany or physics gone to wreck, just when one wants to apply it to geology; one's mathematics in like ruin, when he would apply it to astronomy or optics! The same study taken up almost *de novo* at two or three several periods of life! Who can tell the amount of disgust, weariness, and waste of power, involved in such a course? Nor will it do for the few who have been educated under happier auspices to take themselves as fair examples of the majority. The rule is the other way in most of our American schools, and in many of our colleges. The young are sent to draw water at the springs of knowledge, not with buckets, but with cullenders. Great attention is paid to pouring in fresh streams, but little to stopping the holes in the bottoms of the vessels. Nor is this philosophy of economizing force by constant repetition of mental acts, and logical sequence of subjects, vitally appreciated even in later life. It is most seriously and damagingly lost sight of everywhere.

While nearly all the articles in this collection contain thoughts of real value, those of Professor Henfrey on the Educational Claims of Botanical Science, and of Professor Faraday on the Education of the Judgment, are especially worthy of notice. In following Professor Henfrey through the argument in which he develops the principles on which the rational classifications of botany are based, and the rela-

tions subsisting between this science and other sciences, the reader cannot but feel the force of the claim put forth, that, in mastering the method of this one science, the mind receives an invaluable aid toward methodical habits of thought in all departments of knowledge, and grasps principles that "are applicable to all cases in which mankind are called upon to bring the various parts of any extensive subject into mental co-ordination." To look on, and see any one part of man's intellectual work on earth so ably accomplished as the reduction of the apparent jumble and chance-medley of the vegetable world to the splendid order in which it now stands to the intelligent eye, gives a lesson in the possibility of method, the reign of law, the capacity of reason, and the final reward of patient persistence, which cannot but brace the mind, clear the eye, and assure the faith for every other department of mental labor. The value, moreover, of the terminology of botanical science in cultivating habits of accuracy and perspicuity in the use of *language*, is forcibly urged by Professor Henfrey. The same principles underlie a strong and vivid use of words alike in science and in poetry,—the observation of some fact first, and then a symbol to express it. Dry and technical as the terminology of botany may seem, its study, nevertheless, furnishes an admirable discipline for the right use of language in all other departments. Every adjective here is an honest adjective. It has its special reason for being. It sheds light; it fixes the eye on a real quality; it gives the mind a quick sense of the thousandfold minutely differing shades of attributes that enter into all thorough description of objects, and furnishes it with a lesson of the first importance alike to the historian, the metaphysician, or the poet. The scientific description of a single flower, as, step by step, the language refers us to a long series of delicately observed facts, is a grand triumph in the art of expression, and shows the true method of discriminating and realizing speech on all subjects.

The article of Professor Faraday, on the Education of the Judgment, is absolutely religious in its tone, though not tech-

nically so. A pure love of truth breathes through every line in which he dwells on the fallibility of the senses, and the needful correctives to the deceptions they so often impose on the judgment. This article, taken in connection with his replies to the English Public Schools' Commission, reveals a singularly simple and truth-loving nature, and speaks volumes for the ethical influence of ardent scientific pursuits. "The correcting blush of shame, which should be brought to the cheeks of all who feel convicted of neglecting the beautiful living instrument wherein play all the powers of the mind," expresses his own lowly reverence for the endowment of intelligence. And the rules he lays down, and the life-long self-restraint he urges, in the work of counteracting aberrations, and keeping the mind from running wild, can be studied with profit by all.

While the impression left by the strong and often eloquent appeals of each of the many writers in favor of the claims of his special department in the work of education is one not easily to be shaken off, still we cannot but feel, on closing the book, that the title chosen by Dr. Youmans — "The Culture Demanded by Modern Life" — is too comprehensive. The "demanded" cannot be too strongly emphasized. No man can be other than an ignoramus, no man can do thorough work in any department — agriculture, manufacturing, history, politics, literature, medicine, theology — who is not more or less grounded in the methods and results of modern science. A new view of the universe has been reached, which exerts its influence on regions of thought seemingly at the farthest remove from abstract science. The very strains in which modern poetic sorrow pours out its hopes and dreads, as in Tennyson's "In Memoriam," are unintelligible except in the light of the change which has come over human thought through the discoveries of science. But the phrase "the culture" is too exclusive. It is only a part of the culture to which our attention is here drawn, — an indispensable part, a part we must have at any cost, — but still a part only. Of philology, literature, æsthetics, history, ethics, little, comparatively, is said. The "classical question" is indeed more

or less discussed, and very sensibly, by Dr. Barnard. But, in the book as a whole, there is a want of balance, a one-sided view of education. Too narrow ground is taken. The superior question of linguistic and literary culture is subordinated to debating the issue, whether the *classics* shall be studied, or how much time shall be devoted to them. It is well enough to declaim against the exclusive devotion that has in the past been paid to Greek and Latin; against the wretchedly barren results of most of the time spent on them; against the pitiable ignorance of the laws and phenomena of the marvellous universe in which we live, which have accompanied, and come out of, such misdirected labor. But would not the opponents of the arrogant claims urged for the protracted study of Greek and Latin make a far more telling presentation of the case, did they emphasize the fact, that, in the mastery of the three most prominent modern languages, — English, French, and German; languages acquired in half the time that must be spent on the classics, and with the added advantage, that the exigencies of reading and study in all departments keep them in constant use and freshness, — the mind is introduced to a literature outweighing by far that of Greece and Rome; at any rate, as one in a thousand comes to appreciate the latter. The Greek and Latin of almost all college men are written on the sand, and obliterated by the first rising tide of pressing practical life. But it is not so with their French and German. They need these, in the study of their professions, for the ideas embodied in them, and retain and enhance their facility in using them through the very exigencies of actual life that divert them from the classics. In the acquisition of these modern languages, there is opportunity enough offered to secure any requisite amount of grammatical training, and knowledge of the laws of language: while the comparative ease with which they are mastered and retained leaves far more time, and above all inclination, for the enjoyment of the varied charms of the poetry, fiction, essays, dramas, histories, treatises, they give access to. Had the volume before us embraced two or three articles, from competent hands, setting forth the just claims of linguistic



and literary studies, showing how thorough and serious they need to be, and pointing out what vastly superior results would come, in most cases, of conducting them through the modern languages, or even one's vernacular alone, it would have proved much more rounded and satisfactory, as an exhibition of the full culture demanded by modern life. Had Dr. Latham, for example, developed and illustrated at length his words quoted on page eight,—“A man's mother tongue is the best medium for the elements of scientific philology, simply because it is the one he knows best in practice,”—it would have done more to correct the fanaticism and traditionalism connected with the arrogant claims of the Greek and Latin, as the sole true media of grammatical training, than any amount of declamation against the abuses connected with classical studies.

Half the ardent defenders of the classics, in their controversy with the scientists, are battling, not so much for Greek and Latin,—though they think they are,—as for the study of language; for literary culture; for the inspiring influence of the ever young, ever original thoughts and music of the men of genius, whom no progress of scientific discovery ever out-dates. Science, in all its departments, confirms, and never overthrows, a Homer or a Shakespeare. And so it does with all the great sons of inspiration. The best that science can do, with all its researches into the influences exerted on man by climate, position, food, temperament, disease, institutions, leaves the marvel and the mystery as great as ever. The Italian sun that ripens the beauty and passion of a Juliet, the physiological sequences that culminate in the sublime madness of a Lear, are interesting, are vitally important facts; but our chief interest ever has lain, and ever must lie, in the wonderful life itself. And he who can lead us through the moonlight under Juliet's balcony, or through the wild tempest to listen to the wilder imprecations of the raving king, does for us what no science, no mere analysis of physical connections, can pretend to do. The influence, too, exerted on man by the grand characters of history; by the men of heroic will, and sublime motives, and

lofty consecration, — nothing in education tells more than this. It is in behalf of the heroic men of Greece and Rome who have ennobled his own life, who must not be suffered to become forgotten, that many a defender of classical studies is battling. And yet, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, these very champions have learned more of Socrates and Plato from Grote, more of Epictetus from Higginson, more of Scipio from Arnold, than from all original sources put together. Greece and Rome are one thing, Greek and Latin another.

If the issue were put somewhat in this way, we believe it would receive, and deserve to receive, a fairer hearing than it now does in many quarters. Literary culture every educated man must have. If he can find time to add to his familiarity with Shakespeare, Goethe, and Pascal, a like familiarity with Homer, Æschylus, and Virgil, it is, of course, so much clear gain; but practically, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if the real end be to come, soul to soul, in contact with great men and a great literature, it can be done far more effectively through the modern than the ancient languages: and this for the simple reason, that they are so much more easily mastered and heartily enjoyed, and that one of them is our home-bred mother tongue. This whole question of classical studies is largely one of time and capacity. The day has gone by when men can rationally congratulate themselves on proficiency in them, gained at the cost of ignorance of modern thought. But with improved methods of teaching, with the disposition now manifest to extend the time devoted to preparatory education, with the clearer conceptions that are gaining ground of the right periods of life for entering upon the various branches of study, we are fully persuaded that room will still be found, by a select class, for such attention to Greek and Latin as shall secure competency to enjoy the masterpieces of form and thought they embody. Greece and Rome have done some things in literature, that, in certain aspects, have never been equalled, that set up an eternal and imperishable standard. This decides the question whether they shall be studied. The true student

will have the best the world contains, will press through all obstacles after it, will live in the first intellectual society. It will always be a pain to a superior mind not to know Homer, Sophocles, Virgil, Tacitus, and Cicero.

It would be doing manifest injustice, however, to the spirit of Dr. Youmans' volume to seem even to imply that a narrow utilitarian stand-point is assumed in it. It is so full of a sense of the infinite resources of mental invigoration and intellectual satisfaction inviting us in the vast and half-explored book of nature, that it is easy to pardon an apparent oversight of certain other fields of culture. It is full, too, of cheerful, and sometimes exuberant, faith and hope in a nobler future for man, growing out of his awakening consciousness of the marvellous and splendid forces now for the first time placed at his disposal through the revelations of modern science. The bearings of science on the amelioration of the condition of society receive ample discussion. Several of the essays — those of Dr. Hodgson on the study of Economic Science, and of Mr. Herbert Spencer on Political Education, especially — point out, and open up, vast fields for intelligent, benevolent, and confident thought and action in the promotion of human welfare; while, at the same time, they faithfully paint the confusion and misery that have come, not of ignorance alone, but of ignorance conjoined with the best intentions and the most disinterested spirit. The list of subjects indicated is large enough to furnish centuries of work for the best heads and the best hearts. Of *work*, however! And herein lies the great merit of these essays. They unfold and seriously impress the great conception of the absolute and invariable reign of law over all the affairs of men. They insist on knowledge of the established conditions of success. They battle with the foolish limitations of the sphere of science to stones and stars and plants and animal functions. They demand as rigorous an application of scientific methods to the study of health and intelligence and virtue, of trade and politics and pauperism and insanity, as to the department of optics or mechanics. They bring the studies of the school and the college into intimate alliance

with the serious work of after-life. And they do all this so strongly and eloquently that, wherever the volume goes, it will stimulate thought and shed light.

---

### ART. III. — CURTIS ON INSPIRATION.

*The Human Element in the Inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures.* By T. F. CURTIS, D.D., late Professor of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Penn. New York : D. Appleton & Co., 1867.

THE question of the inspiration of the Bible is evidently receiving increased attention and inviting a new discussion at the present time. The labors of Coleridge and Dr. Arnold in this field, a generation ago, accomplished hardly any thing more than to break ground, and open the inquiry. The fearless head-master of Rugby School, in a letter on Coleridge's "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," speaks of Inspiration as "that momentous question which involves in it so great a shock to existing notions,—*the greatest, probably, that has ever been given since the discovery of the falsehood of the Pope's infallibility.*" Since Dr. Arnold's day, the fortress of the then "existing notions" of Scripture infallibility has been beleaguered by hosts of powerful assailants. Criticism has captured the outworks; philosophy undermined the foundations; and the methods of modern science made wholly ineffectual the old means of defence. Yet it may fairly be doubted, whether the predicted "great shock" has ever yet been felt by the multitudes who are within the walls, and whose battle-cry is still only a paraphrase of the famous declaration of Chillingworth, "The Bible, the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants." The approved orthodoxy of Arnold and Coleridge on other points has not made them safe and trusty guides in this. Plenary Inspiration and Verbal Infallibility may be regarded, by liberal thinkers, as "exploded" notions; but they are thought to be good enginery of defence by thousands of Christian preachers, and tens of thou-



sands of "pious Christian folk." Could the views of Arnold and Coleridge, to say nothing of more radical doctrines, be submitted to-day to the vote of collective Protestantism in England and this country, those eminent Christian scholars would be classed among the men "who make the Word of God of none effect" through their speculations.

In view of this state of opinion in the theological world, it is certainly a matter of surprise, that no theologian of the Liberal school has written a work upon this all-important and fundamental subject of inspiration. Our Unitarian armory, it is true, has furnished not a few weapons, wherewith the infallibility of the Scriptures has been most vigorously assailed. Channing, Dewey, Burnap, and others of our older writers, have discussed the question, either directly or incidentally; and the Note in Mr. Norton's "*Genuineness of the Gospels*"\* remains to this day one of the best expositions of the fallibility and inferiority of the Old-Testament writings. Among recent writers, Dr. Clarke has given us an interesting chapter on the Inspiration and Authority of the Bible, in his "*Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy*;" while the famous alternative, "*The Bible or the Mathematics*," presents the conclusion of the whole matter, as briefly discussed by the able author of "*Reason in Religion*."

But even this cursory glance at our theological literature is enough to show, that there has been an apparent indifference to the needs of religious thought in this direction that is any thing but praiseworthy. While something has been done by our literary theologians to answer the inquiries of thinking men in regard to the inspiration of the Scriptures, much more which ought to have been done has been left for others to do; and the want of a thorough and comprehensive work on this subject is yet to be supplied. It is not a long time since one of the most popular and effective ministers in our denomination was obliged to give a series of Sunday-evening lectures on "*The Bible, what it is and what it is not*;" a topic upon which the members of his own congrega-

---

\* Norton's *Genuineness of the Gospels*, vol. ii., Note D, pp. xlviii-cciv.

tion were as much in need of information as those who came to hear him from Evangelical churches, and the unchurched masses. That men who are called by their special qualifications and their divine commission to practical religious work, and not to speculative theological discussion, should thus be compelled to lecture on Inspiration, because no fit treatise on the subject can be found for their people to read, is certainly a reproach to theology, and hints at a deficiency in our theological literature that ought long since to have been provided for.

How far Dr. Curtis, in the work recently brought out by the Appletons, on "The Human Element in the Inspiration of the Scriptures," meets this want, remains to be seen. The "religious reticence" which he so justly blames in those who hold new and broader views, but withhold them from others, cannot be charged on Dr. Curtis himself. Indeed, the chief value of his work is to be found in its frank and full expression of views and opinions "gained only very slowly, unwillingly, and against every earthly prepossession." After having held for many years the professorship of Theology in the University at Lewisburg, Dr. Curtis at last felt obliged to resign his situation, because of the growing divergence between his own convictions and the opinions of his denomination—the Baptist—on the subject of Inspiration. "It appeared to me," he says, in the preface to his work, "that men in evangelical religious circles were, for the most part, too cautious in speaking with candor, or in making any concessions not absolutely wrung from them by the force of circumstances; and that the tendency of much of the teaching in our theological seminaries is to stifle deep, thorough, and candid inquiry on all these points, and therefore to leave our rising ministry quite unprepared for the work of the age before them." Feeling, therefore, out of sympathy with such conservatism, and being obliged annually to define his position upon the vexed questions in theology, Dr. Curtis decided to "resign his professorship, examine the whole subject of Inspiration more thoroughly and independently, and publish such conclusions as might seem

calculated to assist others tried by the same difficulties and struggles."

The work before us, the result of this independent and careful study, seems admirably adapted both to interest and instruct those for whom it was written. Without aiming at an exhaustive treatment of the subject, or pretending to remove all the philosophical and critical difficulties in which it is involved, Dr. Curtis has given a comprehensive, and in the main impartial, survey of the various theories of Inspiration; has stated with clearness, and without exaggeration, the principal objections which science and criticism have urged against the infallibility of the Bible; and has rendered a valuable service to the cause of rational religion by his able defence of the equal importance of God's *other* revelations in nature and providence, in history, and the religious experience of all good men. "*A stronger faith*," he tells us, "*in the great principles of universal religion* is the chief want of our day."—"The whole Church of the future groweth into a holy temple only by incorporating materials from every dispensation and revelation of the past."—"There are many religious truths progressively revealed by natural religion, by science, and history, which yet cannot be learned from the most diligent study of the Scriptures alone. . . . God's true revelation, as a whole, expands with each age." Such sentences as these have a very unevangelical ring. They remind us, rather, of some of the best passages of Theodore Parker in the chapter on the Bible in his "Discourse of Religion:" "The Bible is one ray out of the sun, one drop from the infinite ocean. . . . Its truths are old as creation, repeated more or less purely in every tongue. . . . Let the Word of God come through conscience, reason, and holy feeling, as light through the windows of morning."\*

Indeed, it would be difficult to distinguish the general position of Dr. Curtis, in respect to the inspiration of the Bible, from that of Mr. Parker. "The influence of the Bible," says Parker, "past and present, rests on its profound re-

---

\* Parker's Discourse of Religion, pp. 376, 377.

ligious significance. . . . If wisely used, it is still a blessed teacher." \*

The true view of the purpose of the Scriptures, according to Dr. Curtis, is this: "That, when we have faithfully studied them in connection with the whole of what we can obtain from God's other revelations of his will, we may arrive at truth in every point of doctrine, duty, and knowledge, with a precision and certainty proportioned to our necessities." †

"The Word of God!" says Parker,—"no Scripture can hold that. It speaks in a language no honest mind can fail to read." ‡

"The teachings of all history," Dr. Curtis tells us, "past and present, contain, as surely as the Bible, lessons from God, to be diligently studied; and the whole form the Scriptures of the true Christian." §

We have given these citations from books written from widely different points of view, with no purpose of raising a prejudice against the work of Dr. Curtis, by thus showing his main position to be the same with that of Mr. Parker. It is the *fact* alone of this essential identity of views which here concerns us. Indeed, for all practical purposes, there are but two general theories of Inspiration, which divide the theological world to-day: the one, that on which Dr. Curtis and Mr. Parker are in the main agreed; and the other, the accepted Orthodox theory, which both these writers alike assail. Dr. Curtis, it is true, recognizes three classes of views: 1. That which maintains that the inspiration of Scripture secures its absolute infallibility in every part; 2. That which claims this absolute infallibility for the *religious* portions of Scripture alone; and, 3. That which regards Inspiration as not destroying, but elevating, the human element in man, while conferring *no* absolute immunity from infirmity and error. But those who hold the first and second of these theories are in reality only different parties in the

---

\* Discourse of Religion, p. 375.

† pp. 323-324.

‡ Discourse of Religion, p. 370.

§ p. 318.



same theological camp. Whatever controversy these may wage against one another, they present an unbroken front to all those who affirm, with Dr. Curtis, that "an infallible revelation is not necessary for man." The three views, therefore, which, according to Dr. Curtis, represent the main and leading opinions on the inspiration of the Bible, are resolvable into *two*: that which affirms, and that which denies, the infallibility, and hence the exceptional inspiration, of the Old and New Testament Scriptures.\*

Dr. Clarke, in his "Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy," proposes a very different classification, which we cannot regard as either so clear in statement or so accurate as that which we are reviewing. There are but three views, he tells us, in regard to the inspiration of the Bible. "There may be modifications of these, but nothing essentially different." These three views are,—1. Plenary inspiration, the Orthodox theory; 2. No inspiration, the Naturalistic theory; and, 3. The Mediatorial view, the theory which mediates between the Orthodox and Naturalistic theories. We have already

---

\* The position that the Scriptures do not contain an infallible revelation from God is held by many of the most eminent Unitarians of the present day. Thus Dr. Hedge affirms, that there is—

"no infallible oracle out of the breast. . . . However desirable it may seem that infallible guidance from without should have been vouchsafed to our perplexity, however we may covet it and sigh for it, *it has not been so ordained.*" — *Reason in Religion*, p. 205.

Dr. James Freeman Clarke holds the same view:—

"Orthodoxy is right," he says, "in maintaining the supreme excellence and value of the Christian Scriptures, but wrong in claiming for them infallible accuracy. It is right in saying that they were written by inspired men, but wrong in considering this inspiration a guarantee against all possible error and mistake." — *Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy*, p. 128.

But the strongest as well as clearest statement of this view of the Bible is given by Dr. Noyes, in the Note to the Introduction in the new edition of his "Translation of the Hebrew Prophets:"—

f "There is limited, yet trustworthy, but no absolute, infallible authority whatever for man. . . . The human senses, the human intellect, the human memory, oral tradition, and historical records, are all fallible. Yet by their aid we may attain, not only faith, but knowledge. The light which it has pleased God to bestow upon us is amply sufficient to guide us to the blessedness for which we were designed in this world and that which is to come. Whether the necessities or the interests of humanity would be better promoted by an infallible standard of doctrine and duty, either in a written volume, in a church, or a single individual, is a question which it is not worth while to discuss. What God has done, not what it is necessary or useful for him to do, is the important concern for us" (p. xci).

shown that the real dividing line between the Orthodox theory and its opposite is not that of a so-called plenary inspiration, but that of the alleged *infallibility* of the Scriptures. Doubtless the majority of Orthodox believers still hold to the doctrine of verbal or plenary inspiration. But this is because such a doctrine is supposed to be necessary as a basis and support of the infallibility of the Bible. This *mechanical* theory of inspiration, as it has well been called, might be given up, as indeed it has been abandoned by some eminent Orthodox theologians; while the infallibility of the Bible would still remain, though limited in its application to the religious and theological truths which the Scriptures contain. On the other hand, the Naturalistic theory given by Dr. Clarke does not, we believe, fully represent the view of those who are supposed to hold it. Such was not the theory of Mr. Parker, as the eloquent passage from his chapter on the Bible, which Dr. Clarke has quoted, abundantly proves. Indeed, when Dr. Clarke himself goes so far as to say, that "while there may be a wide gulf between the inspiration of the Bible and that of the Vedas, or of Homer or Plato, *yet they may all belong to the same class*," he has very nearly expressed the view of the Bible held by such Naturalistic theologians as Mr. Parker. Any difference of opinion as to the comparative width of the separating "gulf" may well be regarded, from a philosophical point of view, as of no importance whatever.

With respect to Dr. Clarke's third class of views, the Mediatorial, we are at a loss to know what such views are, and by whom they are held. Certainly not by Dr. Clarke himself, who, after denying emphatically the infallibility of Scripture, gives us, as his own conclusion, the statement, that we may have a "faith in the New Testament as being, in some sense or other, a revelation; as being written, in some way or other, by inspired men; as being, somehow or other, a holy book."\*

Let us now put by the side of this what Mr. Parker says,

---

\* Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy, p. 128.

in his chapter on the Excellence of the Bible: "Little needs now be said of the New Testament, of the *simple truth* that rustles in its leaves, its parables, epistles, where Paul lifts up his manly voice, and John pours out the mystic melody of his faith."\* If "simple truth" may be called, "*in some sense or other*, a revelation," and if Paul's manly voice and the mystic melody of John's faith can be said to have come, "*in some way or other*," from "inspired men," it is fair to ascribe to Mr. Parker and Dr. Clarke the same general view of the Bible, "as being, *somehow or other*, a holy book."†

But we have wandered from our main purpose, which is not to find fault with the useful and suggestive book of Dr. Clarke, but to call attention to certain points in the equally suggestive work of Dr. Curtis. The chief service which this work will render to Liberal theology will be the awaken-

---

\* Discourse of Religion, p. 373.

† Professor Parsons, in his recent work, "Deus Homo," furnishes another of these threefold classifications of theories on Inspiration. There are, he tells us, — 1. "Those who hold to the literal Bible, sternly and without compromise;" 2. "Those who believe that the Bible is only a most excellent book of human composition;" 3. "Those who hold firmly to their Bible, and cannot doubt that its writers were inspired by the Spirit of God, that they wrote the words of God, and that these must be true." Those who hold this view are not, indeed, hostile to science, "some of whose conclusions they cannot deny;" but they hope some way will be discovered to reconcile these apparent opposites, and "they see no other basis for this hope than the doctrine of a *spiritual sense* of the Word." The confusion in this classification of views is apparent on the surface. The author of "Deus Homo" is evidently to be reckoned in the class of those who hold, not only to the possibility, but also to the fact, of an infallible revelation of divine truth, as opposed to Drs. Curtis, Hedge, Clarke, and Noyes, and the majority of Liberal theologians of the present day. The only point in dispute between the disciple of Swedendorg and the Orthodox, "who hold to the literal Bible," is this: Can the infallibility of the Scriptures be best supported by the doctrine of its plenary inspiration, or by what Professor Parsons calls the "spiritual sense of the Word"? We are content to leave the doctrine of an infallible revelation to its fate between the upper and nether millstones of literalism and allegorical interpretation, while we believe, with Dr. Noyes, that "those Christians enjoy a stronger as well as a purer faith, who, giving up the doctrine of Scripture infallibility as a dream, conceding to authority its just weight, yet guarding against its undue influence, feel bound to trust their own reason under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, as the supreme judge, believing that to deny reason is to deny God." — *Introduction to Translation of the Prophets*, Note, p. xci.

ing of inquiry among those who have never had the opportunity to learn what modern science and criticism have done to make the old theory of Inspiration untenable. We could wish that the author had confined his discussion more closely to the special subject announced in the title, and had omitted the somewhat extensive survey which he has given of the great field of theological controversy, as well as the uncalled-for and unnecessary biographical sketches of famous theologians. We regret, also, that Dr. Curtis has not defined more clearly and exactly the nature of that Inspiration which he claims alike for the humblest Christian and the greatest prophet or apostle,—for the Scriptures of heathen, no less than of Jewish, origin. In one place he tells us, that the work of the Spirit, both in the inspiration of holy writings and holy men, is “to elicit into distinct manifestation, and to quicken, the individual powers of the inspired one.” Yet, in another place, we are told that the inspiration of the writers of the Old and New Testaments “*gave* them certain *divine powers*.” We are still more surprised, that, in his anxiety to show what is the underlying truth in the error of Orthodoxy, Dr. Curtis has been led, in one section of his work, to claim for the Bible a “practical infallibility.” Elsewhere he has met the question of Scripture infallibility squarely, and without evasion. “Where, then, it is asked, shall we find an infallible and complete revelation? And to this we reply frankly. *Nowhere on earth*” (p. 326). And again: “No one considers infallibility necessary or possible, *practically*, in any other branch of knowledge, however vital: why, then, in this, the most profound in its researches, abstract in its essential principles, and complicated of them all?” (p. 327.)

We have no desire to pursue any farther the criticism of what, after all, are but minor defects in a work whose general positions are so well maintained, and so thoroughly on the side of a liberal and rational Christianity. The cause of vital, practical religion demands of theology a frank and complete statement of what the Bible is, and what it is not. The Bibliolatry of the present day is no fancied superstition,



but a very real and formidable obstacle in the way of truth. On the other hand, the indifference of those who, in ceasing to worship the Bible, have ceased to use it, is equally hostile to the religious life. The Old Testament is fast becoming a sealed book in Christian homes; while the New is rarely made the subject of patient, careful, and candid study. "A popular introduction to the study of the Bible, accessible to all, giving all the assured results of modern criticism, all the best supported probabilities upon doubtful matters, and a summary of the most respectable conjectures on questions hopelessly inaccurate,"\* is needed at the present time far more than the republication of old sermons and essays, however excellent, or the revision of a Bible dictionary written in the interests of a moderate, but always prejudiced, Orthodoxy. On its speculative side, the subject of Inspiration is likely to be sufficiently discussed in the great controversy, which is still far enough from being settled, between the Positive and Intuitional philosophies. But there is a practical side of the question, for whose decision those who are not philosophers cannot await the issue of these speculations. Nor is the decision so difficult as is sometimes imagined. What is needed is perfect freedom from prejudice, perfect fairness in dealing with all the facts in the case. Let those who urge that the Bible should be read like any other book acknowledge with Parker the significance of the facts, that no other collection of writings has taken such hold on the world as this; that, while famous writers on morals and religion have arisen in one century to be forgotten in the next, "the silver cord of the Bible is not loosed, nor its golden bowl broken, as Time chronicles his tens of centuries gone by." In a word, let the radical, the rationalist, and the theist frankly admit the transcendent worth of those Scriptures, to which they themselves have been indebted for so much of their highest truth and their best inspiration. Perhaps it will then be seen, that the simplest and most

---

\* See an admirable article in the "Radical," for March, 1867, on "What the People read," a review of some popular tracts on the Bible by Spiritualists and "Infidels."

rational way to make the inspiration of other scriptures, and of all high literature, appreciated and felt, will be to lead men to a free and loving study of those Scriptures which, for moral and spiritual influence, are still *the Bible par excellence* of humanity.

But equal fairness in dealing with this great question must be demanded of all those, of whatever denominational name, who still hold to the doctrine of Scripture infallibility. Let those who claim for the writers of the Old and New Testaments an inspiration "different *in kind*" \* from that of the saints and prophets of all ages and all dispensations, consider whether such a claim does not strike at the validity of all inspiration, by practically ignoring the divine presence in all history, save that of the Jews. We are grateful for Dr. Curtis' testimony, that, "in all the Evangelical denominations, a growing number of the most intelligent and influential ministers, including some conspicuously active and useful in every good word and work, are quietly drifting in the direction" indicated by the book we have reviewed.

Only on the common ground of accepting the Bible for its mighty influence and its profound religious significance, can all who have at heart the promotion of goodness and piety among men work together in this holy cause. What of good the Bible, worshipped as an idol, and believed to be what modern intelligence knows it is not, has done for humanity in the past, shall be wholly eclipsed in the brightness of its acknowledged excellence as the grandest record of man's converse with the Infinite, the loftiest utterance of the soul's undying faith and hope.

---

\* See an article in the *Christian Examiner*, July, 1867, p. 27.

## ART. IV.—BUNSEN'S EGYPT.

*Egypt's Place in Universal History.* An Historical Investigation, in five books. By C. C. J. BARON BUNSEN, D.Ph., D.C.L., and D.D. Translated from the German by CHARLES H. COTTRELL, Esq., M.A.; with Additions by SAMUEL BIRCH, LL.D. Vol. V. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1867.

IN the long annals of mankind, there appears now and then a name which makes the whole world debtor. More commonly, we find men who, by a certain brute force of will, turn the current of its life, and impress themselves, or at least their eccentricities and idiosyncrasies, indelibly upon its succeeding waves. Of this latter class was John Calvin. Of the former was and is Christian Carl Josias Bunsen. With our hand upon his last volume, the English edition of which appears as the posthumous work of both author and translator, it seems to us that human immortality never found a nobler illustration. The work which survives testifies to the surviving soul. These five volumes suggest a design so magnificent; reveal a learning so wide, so varied, and so accurate; the plan of their publication suggests a faith in humanity so sincere, a faith in Truth, his God, so unwavering, — that the study of them is at once a satisfaction and an inspiration.

When Bunsen began to work, Goodwin, Le Page Renouf, and Dr. Hincks were busy in England; Chabas, De Rougé, and Devéria, in France; Brugsch, Duemichen, Lauth, Lepsius, and Pleyte, in Germany: with a corps of assistants in each country, employed as translators or transcribers. No sooner did one of these men complete any section of his work, than it was published, or copied and sent to the others, that each might have the advantage of the labors of all. In especial, Lepsius and Bunsen exchanged papers, and published their great works in sections, that all possible light might be furnished by both at each advancing step. There was never a finer example of true communion in scholarship: each man fired

with the zeal of knowledge, emulous only as to who should serve most; differing each from the other to the end, as to some important particulars, but never losing, through all, the sense of brotherhood and active trust; and each holding back the results of his own work, till he had examined that of the other.

Still greater obstacles to a popular knowledge of this book than the severe study it requires, may be found in the extent of acquisition demanded to make the reading of it profitable, and the great cost of the volumes themselves. Men may learn to study in time; they may grow in patience with a plan necessarily cumbersome; they may kindle into admiration, and acquire general learning, so as to fit themselves for appreciation: but there is no hope that the cost of these volumes will greatly diminish. That the Messrs. Longman should have been willing to furnish a font of hieroglyphic characters, at a cost such as is usually assumed only by foreign governments, seems somewhat like a miracle, and shows a generous zeal which this author was entitled to kindle.

No books ever published contain ampler learning of the sort that clergymen ought to acquire; none bear more directly, or with more telling force, on the modern debate as to the historic value of our Scriptures: yet they are books which it is hopeless to suppose that more than one clergyman in five hundred will ever glance over, much less study or possess.

In this country, we suppose, no man exists who is qualified to criticise them adequately. Is any qualified by knowledge of the great geologic convulsions which have prepared the globe for the habitation of man, he will fail, perhaps, in knowledge of the distribution of races, and of the philologic suggestions to be found in their own names, and those of their earliest localities. Should he fortunately be familiar with philologic ground, he may fail in intimate acquaintance with those remains of ancient literature which bear all the more truly, because indirectly, upon the great problems to be solved. Should he have mastered these, he must turn his



attention to the sacred books and traditions of all Central Asiatic nations; our own Scripture must be set over against the Zend, the Vendidad, and the Vedas; and the absence of all tradition of a deluge in China and Egypt accounted for. Should he find himself competent to this problem, a severer one confronts him: he must arm himself with a special knowledge of the Semitic languages; and, when these have become familiar as his mother tongue, he must be prepared for a hieroglyphic or hieratic text, and not shrink from an investigation of the modern Coptic. Nor can he proceed without the widest general culture: for the history of Phœnicia must be ransacked for suggestive points; and rare mathematical and astronomical knowledge is required, that he may examine for himself all previous deductions as to the duration of cycles, the various means employed for the correction of the Julian year, and the possible origin of the various phases of Astral worship. Above all, he must be a man with his eyes wide open, who shall readily perceive the significance of all the small facts, daily coming into notice, upon the great problems to be solved. If we are to be governed by the estimate which Bunsen puts upon the labors of his English reviewers, in his fifth volume, England has produced no man better fitted for this work than the critics of our own country; but we need not be so governed, for, of the fairness of the few reviews that have appeared, common sense is a sufficiently competent judge.\*

So far as Bunsen's reviewers have produced any effect upon the popular mind, it has probably been the creating of a certain distrust of Bunsen, founded upon the great difference between his estimate of the period required for the evolution of human civilization, and what is ordinarily called "Biblical

---

\* It is interesting to observe, that the same fond love of patient labor over minute details, which tends to make women eminent observers in astronomy, has already produced one Egyptologist, — Miss Corbaux. We find her, in 1855, writing an Introduction to a work on the so-called Exodus Papyri, by the Rev. J. D. Heath; and, although she started with a false theory, which vitiated her results, Baron Bunsen gives her candid praise, as the first English author who has entered upon the discussion of this subject, and as having intuitively seized, in her starting point, one of the most important problems to be solved.

chronology." It would be well if we could get rid of this Biblical chronology at the outset. Surely, very little scholarship is required to show, that the Bible actually of itself makes no pretension to chronologic accuracy; and that the system which goes by its name, and has so long been active in manacled clergymen and oppressing scholars, is only a mass of Rabbinical corruptions, still further vitiated by the well-meant, but most dishonest, efforts of Eusebius and other early Christians, to force the whole records of the race into a certain conformity with a few numerical suggestions in the body of Holy Writ. Wherever Bunsen finds a numerical statement in the Scripture, however discrepant with actual facts, he expects to find an honest basis for the number, and looks for it.\* It was as if by inspiration that he lighted in the beginning upon the period of "21,000 years for the nutation of the ecliptic," as the proper field in which to work out his problem, — certainly not too large, when we consider that Dr. Birch has found the evidences of highly advanced civilization lying beneath the mud of the Delta, at a depth where the successive accretions of 11,000 years must have hidden them; and, if it is proper to judge of the age of long-buried lacustrine cities by the thickness of such over-deposits, why not admit the evidence when it relates to the manufacture of glass or the weaving of cloth? The 4,000 years of the Biblical chronology, Bunsen thinks an accurate measure of the beginning of national history on earth; or, what is equivalent, the beginning of our consciousness of continuous existence.

In the "Journal of Sacred Literature" for October, 1859, the author assumes a positive knowledge of early Egyptian history; the self-complacency of which shows him absolutely unable to appreciate the slow accumulative processes of Bunsen's investigations, and clinches the objections to his state-

---

\* A remarkable instance of this is to be found in the 215 years which the Jewish people were supposed to have passed in Egypt, — a numeration which he conclusively proves to refer to the period of their *oppression*, which they could not be supposed likely to forget, and beside which the pleasant memory of the long period of prosperous residence faded into thin air.

ments, regarding the residence in Egypt, with the childish wonder, that, in the many attempts to reconstruct the extinct dynasties of Egypt, the statement in Isaiah, that "*the Assyrian oppressed Israel without cause*" should have been so *strangely neglected*! The passage (Isa. lii. 4), as it actually stands in the English version, gives some color to the reviewer's evident inference, that it was in Egypt that the Assyrian oppressed Israel: "For thus saith the Lord God, My people went down aforetime into Egypt, to sojourn there; and the Assyrian oppressed them without cause."\* Surely there is no tolerable Hebrew scholar who will not admit, that, in the original, these two clauses have only this to do with each other,—that they are the separate stages of a climactic statement: once that unhappy people had been oppressed in Egypt; later, the Assyrian oppressed them without cause.†

The "Dublin Review" for February, 1860, if not as incompetent, is still more unfair. "In reference to the authenticity and credibility," it says, "of the remains now ascribed to Manetho, Baron Bunsen does not hesitate to say, that the numbers of Manetho have been transmitted to us quite as correctly as the canon of Ptolemy." Now, nothing is more evident throughout the five volumes of Bunsen's work than the constant effort of the author to correct the text of Manetho from Eratosthenes, the papyri, and the monuments. So far as we can judge, Manetho fell into hopeless chronological confusion, by attempting to give the sum of the *regnal* years in each dynasty, without regard to the orderly succession of reigns.‡ To reduce the exaggeration thus resulting within the likeliest limits, is Bunsen's main object, so far as chronology is concerned; for he believes Manetho to have had access to the royal registers.

---

\* The whole difficulty lies in the punctuation, and the absence of a proper rhetorical inflection.

† Smith's Bible Dictionary, which echoes this criticism of the "Journal," manifests a personal hostility to Bunsen, which vitiates the conclusions in what should be some of the most valuable articles in that valuable book.

‡ See below, p. 323.

A writer in the "Quarterly Review" for 1859 (p. 382 *et seq.*), remarks as follows: "Bunsen *assumes* that Manetho gave 3,555 years as the length of the Egyptian monarchy, and he then makes a mere conjecture the keystone of his arch." Now, this may be a false deduction, not merely of Bunsen, but of Lepsius and Boekh; but it is not an assumption. It is a period wrought out by adherence to a theory based on acknowledged facts; assumed not by *one* man, but the then leading Egyptologists; and so little relied on by Bunsen as to be only once or twice adverted to. The reviewer goes on to object, that Manetho and Eratosthenes lived 3,000 years after the reigns their lists are supposed to authenticate; but what, in the mean time, has become of the contemporaneous lists on the monuments of the 3d and 4th dynasties, of the papyrus coeval with Moses, yet harmonizing with both Manetho and Eratosthenes? Does it become any critic of Bunsen to ignore the "Book of Kings," by Lepsius? So much, then, to show the manifest inadequacy of those who have endeavored to throw ridicule upon these magnificent labors, and to dissipate some bewildering mists. Fortunately for us, God provides against the natural incredulity of man. It is never left to any one person to stem the tide of historical unbelief. Converging lines of investigation, converging results of varied conscientious labors, sooner or later, burn all vital and necessary convictions into human consciousness.

At a recent meeting of the Palestinian Exploration Society, at Oxford, which met, we believe, to examine the photographs of the synagogue recently reconstructed at Capernaum, — the only building now to be identified in which it is known that Jesus of Nazareth once stood; a building reconstructed, it is said, after all these years, without the loss of a single stone, — Sir Henry Rawlinson said, that the excavations now going on at Jerusalem would give us a more exact knowledge of a long period of Hebrew history, than we now possess of any similar period in the Greek and Roman; but an assertion like this, some time before, from Bunsen, met with no reception but ridicule. When, a little before his death,



a new translation of a long-coveted papyrus was brought him, his attendant lamented that it would not be in his power to devote much attention to it; but a joyful light beamed in the eyes of the prostrate scholar, and, as his dying hand added a few notes to the manuscript, he murmured audibly, "It will come so soon, it will come so soon, — the justification of more than I ever dreamed!" Very lately, the French Minister of Public Instruction received a letter from M. Lejean, sent by the French Government to explore the Persian Gulf and its immediate vicinity. He believes himself to have discovered ante-Sanscrit idioms, — to use his own language, *langues paléolariennes*, — still spoken, in a district lying between Kashmir and Afghanistan, by certain mountain tribes; and he thinks these languages more allied to the European tongues than to the Sanscrit itself. In the Persian Gulf, he has followed, step by step, the course of Nearchus, who commanded the fleet of Alexander, and of whose voyage some account is preserved in Arrian. He has also traced the ruins of two Persepolitan cities, whose names have been preserved, the Messambria and Hierametis of Nearchus. At the same time, Unger, the Viennese palæontologist, writes from the pyramid of Dashoor, that in the unburnt bricks of which it is built, bricks moulded and laid at least as early as 3400 B.C., he has discovered manufactured substances, giving evidence of the high civilization already claimed for that period. Recent excavations of Yemenite ruins show, through the Himyarite inscriptions in the cities of Southern Arabia, that a race speaking and writing the same language dwelt in ancient Abyssinia, and on the shores across the straits, the certainty of a hitherto conjectured identity of races throwing much light on many points of Biblical criticism. Rawlinson tells us that the ancient Egyptians thoroughly understood the motive power of steam. The remains of fine Egyptian pottery in the oldest Etruscan tombs; the more recent finding of glass bottles, with Chinese inscriptions upon them, in the oldest tombs at Thebes, — suggest not only the immense antiquity of an almost universal commerce, but show how little effect the most valuable discovery, even that of the art

of printing, can have upon a yet undeveloped people. First discoveries, like the discovery of sulphuric ether as an anæsthetic agent, seem merely tentative. This last discovery was useless, until a certain amount of general medical skill made its practical employment necessary on the one hand, and safe on the other. So the art of printing has availed little in China,—so little, that its use never penetrated to the nations brought into the closest contact with that people. The cities of Bashan are at last uncovered; and the enormous rollers of stone, on which King Og threw back his portal are now revealed to modern eyes. On the other hand, the intelligent zeal of Mr. Wilkinson, the English consul at Saloniki, has proved the authentic use of the word “politarch,” in the eighth verse of the seventeenth chapter of Acts. The use of this word, in relation to a city not known to have any such officers, has been used as an argument against the age of the original manuscript. The exhuming of a buried arch, bearing an inscription in honor of events which took place under the administration of certain “politarchs,” has put that question to rest. While we are debating about the possible authorship and antiquity of the books of Moses, we are forced to acknowledge the age and authenticity of the Turin papyrus, sealed into a sarcophagus nineteen centuries before Christ, and the anonymous, ritualistic “Book of the Dead,” written at least four thousand five hundred years ago; and, in more direct support of Baron Bunsen’s work, we have a treatise recently published by the astronomer of the King of Egypt, Mahmoud Bey. The late viceroy, Said Pacha, ordered from him an astronomical investigation into the relation of the structure of the Pyramids to the dates of their erection. It was obvious that the great pyramid at Ghizeh was built when the rays of Sirius, in passing the meridian of Ghizeh, fell vertically upon the south side. A prolonged calculation shows that this happened 3300 years B.C. The bearing of this calculation is seen, when we state that Bunsen had already fixed the year 3329 as that of the beginning of the reign of Cheops, by whom this pyramid was built.

But, before giving an account of the work, we will speak briefly of the man himself.

Christian Carl Josias Bunsen, chevalier, statesman, philosopher, and theologian, was born, Aug. 25, 1791, at Corbach, the capital of the principality of Waldeck. He studied first at Marburg, and then under the celebrated Heyne at Göttingen. To his own natural bias was now added the impetus given by the influence of the greatest philologist of the time, — an enthusiastic archæologist, and a man whose reputation for integrity had already passed into a proverb. It was quite in keeping with the fact, that his first profound studies were pursued under the master who had done so much to revive a knowledge of Greek and Roman antiquities, that he first came to distinction by winning an academical prize, at the age of twenty-two, for a disquisition on "Athenian Laws of Descent." He then went to Holland and Denmark, to pursue at his leisure a careful study of the tongues spoken in Iceland, Scandinavia, and Friesland. In 1815, he began to study with Niebuhr, whose character and pursuits were still further adapted to educate him for the work he was to undertake. In 1816, he went to Paris, to study the Eastern tongues under Sylvestre de Sacy, then the first living Orientalist. In addition to holding the Persian professorship in the College de France, De Sacy was at this time rector of the University of Paris; and he was a literary man of such value and distinction, that, finding it impossible to replace him, Napoleon had been obliged to retain him in office after he had refused to take the oath of hatred to royalty. His Arabic grammar and anthology are still in use; and, as a Persian scholar, he has never been surpassed. While Bunsen was at Paris, Niebuhr had gone as Prussian minister to Rome; and, as soon as he quitted De Sacy, he joined his former teacher as secretary of legation. He met at Rome the King of Prussia, whom he greatly interested by his marked Protestant ardor; and, in 1824, several important changes were wrought in the relations of the Prussian Church and State by his influence over the king. In 1827, he succeeded Niebuhr as Prussian Minister; but, not being able to influence the Papal See to the extent of his desires, he re-

signed his position in 1837, or rather exchanged it for that of Minister to the Swiss Federation. In 1841, he was appointed Minister to England, to consult the English Government on the formation of a Protestant bishopric, which he fondly hoped would secure the interests of reform; and he was, later, more formally appointed Minister to the Court of St. James. At that time he wrote in German, and printed, we believe at Hamburg, his work on "The Constitution of the Church of the Future," afterwards translated and printed at London in 1847. It is probable that the political prejudice excited against this Prussian project, which all parties seem to have shared, created an impression unfavorable to the reception of his more scholarly work. Bunsen believed in the possibility of a Christian nation, — of a Christian state. The manner in which this Church was linked to cumbrous Prussian machinery made it seem to most men impracticable and absurd, a fair mark for ridicule, and gave to his own name and Gladstone's an unenviable prominence for the time. Niebuhr had studied at Edinburgh; and, while with him in Rome, Bunsen had married the daughter of an English clergyman. From that time, England seems to have divided his affections with his native country, and some of his most valuable studies were pursued at the British Museum. At the request of his king, he presented to the Court of Prussia a memorial upon the formation of a constitutional government like that of England. He favored the cause of Schleswig-Holstein, and, by a memoir to Palmerston, protested against England's attitude in regard to it. Sympathizing with the Western allies, rather than with Prussia, he resigned his position, at the beginning of the Eastern war in 1853, and removed to Heidelberg, where he was at once regarded as the leader in all matters relating to Christian liberty.

His most distinguished works, beside that under review, are "Hippolytus and his Times" (two volumes, Leipsic, 1853), and "Complete Bible-work for the Christian Community" (two volumes, Brockhaus, Leipsic, 1853). The latter work is divided into three parts, — the first giving the newly translated text of the Old and New Testament, with abundant



notes; the second is the completion of the first, containing Bible texts historically arranged and explained; and the third consists of treatises on various subjects, such as the "Everlasting Kingdom" and the "Life of Jesus." This book had not attained its perfect form at the time of his death.

"Egypt's Place in History" was published at Hamburg and Göttingen in five volumes, from 1845 to 1860; and the English translation followed rapidly upon the German issue. The last volume, however, has only just come to this country, having been published about the last of May. Its contents, which are at this moment of special interest to the scholar, may be briefly noted here. It contains, first, a final statement of the Problems to be solved; then the Key to these problems. In this Key we have, 1st, A solution of Problems exclusively Egyptian, under which the first and second problems of the third dynasty, and the problem of the builders of the Great Pyramids, are treated; 2d, Chronological results connected with Biblical, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Greek synchronisms, giving points of contact before and after Solomon; 3d, Results connected with the Problem of reconstructing the ancient ante-chronological, but epochal, history of Egypt; 4th, Corollaries, philosophical and practical. In this final treatment, Bunsen draws in the slides of his telescope, and rests upon the acknowledged Alexandrian chronology in reference to Egypt,—a chronology, however, which does not bring the construction of the Great Pyramid so nearly into the place assigned it by Mahmoud Bey, as his own theoretic extension. Then follows an Appendix, in which the Baron examines the position of his reviewers; and then—that which gives to this work its special value, and puts it in the power of every scholar to become a critic, if he will—Dr. Birch's translation of the "Book of the Dead;" a Dictionary of Hieroglyphics occupying 150 pages; a Hieroglyphic Grammar occupying 130 pages; and thirteen selected Egyptian texts, with their translations,—these texts being among the most valuable for purposes of Biblical criticism. This is followed by fifty pages devoted to a comparison of old and new Egyptian words, and to a comparison of these with the Semitic and Iranian; and, finally, we have the fragments of Philo Byblus, with comments

by Dr. Bernays, and a revision and Latin preface by Bunsen, completed, we believe, only a short time before his death.

That this pupil of Heyne, Niebuhr, and Champollion (with whom Bunsen studied at Rome in 1826) should be only half prepared for his great work, was manifestly impossible. The story we have told shows that he was fitted for his work, not only by his philological and archæological studies, not only by a rare knowledge of language, science, history, and governments, but by personal contact, prolonged and close, with the most eminent scholars of his day in the same walks, by an ardent devotion to Protestant Christianity, his love of Christian liberty, and his freedom from all fear that any efforts of his could shake the foundations of eternal truth. As a politician, he was from the beginning fastidiously conscientious. There is, indeed, one reason why those who know Bunsen well will hardly expect his labors to come to speedy appreciation. He was, as a man, far too well balanced to challenge immediate sympathy; he held out his hand cordially to both the left wing and the right; he could see truth and zeal on the side of his opponents. And while, on the one hand, he fearlessly laid Theology under his scalpel, on the other, he treated its dead body with reverent consideration. Fanaticism is far more acceptable to mankind than a radical toleration.

Of the last months of his life we have no trustworthy account, although it is quite possible that such an account is in existence. His beautiful last words, spoken to the beloved English wife who leaned over his pillow, have floated across the Atlantic, and touched all our hearts: "In thy face have I seen the Eternal."

We have now to consider the way in which Bunsen approaches the great historical problem he has attempted to solve. To deploy an army of facts so vast as that he deals with,\* he needs a very wide field; and this is how he finds it:—

---

\* Especially for the growth of language, according to the known conditions of its development.

He takes, as the basis of his chronological scheme, the astronomical cycle of 21,000 years,—the period during which our summer solstice falls successively in every portion of the earth's orbit.\* At present, as is well known, the summer in the northern hemisphere is at the time of the earth's greatest distance from the sun; hence the season is longer and more temperate: while, in the southern hemisphere, the summer is hotter and fiercer, the winter longer and colder, than in the same latitude at the north. Our summer season, reckoning from the vernal to the autumnal equinox, is thus eight days longer than our winter; and this may be called, for us, the favorable portion of the cycle. The most favorable moment occurs when the solstitial point—that is, the sun's highest northern declination—falls exactly at the portion of the orbit farthest from the sun: this moment (which we may call the noon of the favorable period) fell, by the reckoning of astronomers, in the year A.D. 1248. Now, as Bunsen argues, the work of the creation of man necessarily supposes the most favorable conditions of light and heat, which he finds in the corresponding period, reckoning back 21,000 years from the date above given; in round numbers, about B.C. 20,000. The intermediate period—nearly B.C. 10,000—being that of the greatest climatic depression, is associated by Bunsen with the great geological changes which are indicated by the Deluge.

But he supposes that a greater climatic change was wrought at the period known as that of the Flood, than would have

---

\* This period is obtained as follows: Adding together 50.1" (the annual amount of the retreat of the equinoctial point in the heavens, owing to the phenomenon called "precession of the equinoxes") to 11.8" (the annual amount of the "revolution of the apsides," in the contrary direction), we obtain 61.9" for the annual motion of the point of the earth's aphelion relative to the nodes of the ecliptic; and, dividing by this the whole number of seconds in 360 degrees (1,296,000), we find the above number, 21,000 (more precisely, 20,985), for the cycle of the revolution of the seasons.

In virtue of "precession," modified by "nutation," the terrestrial pole describes a tremulous circle in the heavens, of about 47° diameter, about the pole of the ecliptic, once in 25,868 years. The several stars which are thus made successively "pole-stars" to the earth, afford an important element in fixing some of the cardinal dates in Egyptian history.

occurred in the natural order of things. The slightest preponderance of matter at any point of the earth's surface will necessarily alter the relations of the poles to the plane of the ecliptic. Should this occur suddenly, by any monstrous volcanic action, such as would uplift a continent, the change in the inclination of the axis would be very sudden, and might alter all the conditions of terrene life. If Greenland were to be loosed from the bottom of the sea, and were to float into the southern hemisphere, the whole climate of the globe would change; nay, it is hardly too violent a supposition to say that the tropics and the poles might possibly change places. We have such evidences of convulsion stamped into the geologic history of the earth, — traces of tropical vegetation and mammoth existences so near the poles; traces of marine botany and ocean life on Alpine heights, — that it would seem as if such changes must have taken place, whether before or after the creation of man; and, if so, the present inclination of the earth's axis may be a comparatively modern thing. The longest diameter of a planet must sway it to the sun; and, when the substance is heaped up so as to bring this length into a new place, there will be an entire change of climate, genera, and species. Old coasts would sink, reefs rise, and seas disappear or be created. There seem to be indications of such changes in the positions of still other planets. This explanation, nowhere offered in detail by our author, we are obliged to assume for him, or leave his conclusions as to the pre-delugic period in such uncertainty as must greatly detract from their usefulness.

Before coming to the historical results he considers himself to have attained, it is necessary to explain still another point, — the history of the Egyptian year. If any man of the present day wishes to prove himself descended from some remote, distinguished ancestor, he in the first instance traces the family of that ancestor as far down as possible, and then carries his own as far up as possible. If at the point of junction, where the keystone of his arch of evidence should be, he finds only a void, he must search on one side for that which may give indirect evidence of its previous existence. The fallen stone



is often found far from its original bed. Now, in the genealogy of the world, the history of Egypt is this keystone. It is a bridge connecting modern life with ancient; and its well-kept registers, to which even Herodotus refers, abound in synchronisms, which assist us to reconstruct other histories as well. It would seem as if its golden sands, its dry atmosphere, and its perished civilization, had been permitted by Providence, in order that the secret of the world's life should be preserved, and no foot of progress stamp out the traces of the world's early and uncertain march. The papyri, tablets, and sarcophagi of Egypt begin to decay when they are placed in Northern museums. We hope the time will come when scholars will press the erection of a museum on her own soil, which shall preserve, and not destroy, and of which all the powers of the civilized world shall become the guardians. The removal of colored bas-reliefs and frescoes has already proved conclusively, that the secret of their long preservation lies in climate, and not in the skill of ancient art.

The Egyptians divided the year into three seasons; viz., 1. The Green Season; 2. The Harvest; 3. The Inundation,—each consisting of four months, of thirty days. Now, the beginning of one of these seasons, at the era when this division of time first occurred, is fixed for us by one of the great natural facts of the country. The first day of the inundation invariably coincides, at Syene, with the summer solstice. Just at that period the waters of the Nile begin to overflow. The ordinary Egyptian year consisted of twelve months, of thirty days each, with only five days added at the close. So, failing to count in the six hours of surplus time remaining at the close of each year, every four years a day was lost, and the season of the inundation was noted one day too soon. In 365 times four, or 1,460 years, it would be noted a whole year too soon; and a whole year must be thrown in to correct the error and equalize solar and lunar notation. Therefore, every fourteen hundred and sixty-first completed a cycle by a sacred, festive year.

The Egyptians had, besides, a civil year; and we trust that patient attention will be given to our attempt to explain this

in a simple way. The restoration of all the ancient chronology of Egypt depends upon the place of this festive year, which was observed as sacred to a very late period of Egyptian history; and, from the later and certainly historic celebrations of it, we must ascend to the period of its institution. Now, this kind of notation was in use in the time of Menes, the first recorded king; that is, as early as 3400 B.C. Let us assume, therefore, that, at the next previous point in time, when the first day of the first month of the season of inundation fell on the solstice, was the period of institution. It may have been 1,460 years earlier; but it must have been as old as that. Here is the division of the seasons:—

*First Tetrameny, or Green Season.*—1. Thoth (opener of the year), November; 2. Paophi, December; 3. Hathor, January; 4. Choriack, February.

*Second Tetrameny, or Harvest Season.*—5. Toby, March; 6. Mechir, April; 7. Phamenoth, May; 8. Pharmuthi, June.

*Third Tetrameny, or The Inundation.*—9. Pachon, July; 10. Paôni, August; 11. Epiphi, September (Hebrew, *Ebib*, or *Abib*); 12. Messori, October.\*

Now it is evident, that, when this system first came into use, the summer solstice fell on the 1st of Pachon, and the winter equinox on the 1st of Messori. The Hebrews carried out of Egypt the name of the eleventh month, *Epiphi*, on the 14th of which they crossed the Red Sea. In the twelfth chapter of Exodus, it is written that they were at this time commanded to alter their calendar, and to begin the year with the month *Ebib*. We wish any words of ours could direct the attention of Egyptologists towards one important inference, hitherto neglected. It is about as well established as any point can be, that the year of Exodus falls between 1314 B.C. and 1320 B.C. Hillel, we believe, ascribes it to the year 1314. Now, it is certain, that, if we can find the year, within this limit, in which the 14th of *Epiphi* fell on the first full moon of the

---

\* It is obvious that the English names attached to these months are not strictly accurate, — only approximate. For example, the first day of the period of the inundation, or the month Pachon, did not properly fall on the 1st of July, but on the solstitial point, the 22d of June.

spring,—about the 14th of our April, at which date the Pass-over has always been celebrated,—we shall find the exact date of the Exodus. On the other hand, it would seem as if the modern Jewish practice, of beginning the year at the autumnal equinox, had some faint and hidden reference to the original place of Epiphi in the Egyptian calendar, or was adjusted to it by Hillel.

Censorinus tells us, that the Egyptians had a great Sothiac year. It began whenever the sun rose at the same moment as the Dog Star. This could happen only once in 1,460 years, when the solar and lunar years met and were made one. One such sacred year was recorded 1,322 years before Christ. Cycles began, therefore, in the years B.C. 4242, 2782, 1322. Now, we have seen that Thoth was the first month of the Egyptian year; and its proper place was unchangeably fixed at 120 days after the solstice. It fell in the right place in the years B.C. 3285 and 1780. Of these five eras, 3285\* B.C. must have been the most remarkable; for then the sun rose with Sirius at the solstice (or seemed so to rise), and the 1st of Thoth fell on the required moment.† About this time, then, Bunsen supposes this calendar to have been instituted. We can see how they came, in time, to have two calendars. The civil year must begin with the 1st of Thoth, no matter how far it had slipped back from its place. The sacred Sothiac year must always begin at the rising of Sirius. They intercalated nothing, but noted the periodical loss, so as to interpolate one year into the calendar once in every 1,460 years. In one Sothiac cycle, the beginning of the year moved through every part of the heavens; which may possibly explain the mystical saying of the priests, when they told Herodotus, that, between the reigns of Menes and Sethos, *the sun had twice risen in the west*. That is, this movable solar year had twice begun at the indicated place in the heavens.

---

\* Bunsen does not explain; but it would seem as if these two dates must have been conformed to the Phœnix cycle, to be mentioned hereafter, and not to the Sothiac.

† If we accept the astronomical conclusions of Mahmoud Bey, is it not quite probable that the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh was erected in this year, to mark and commemorate these extraordinary coincidences?

It was only another way of concealing the sacred year, when it was said that the phoenix rose from its ashes once in 1,500 years. This name, so long believed to be that of a fabulous bird, is, in the original, equivalent to *sæculum*, or "period of years." Its story conveyed the error of the Julian year. The three periods of the Solar or Phoenix cycle had a sort of correspondence to the three divisions of the common year. The first day of the new year was placed unchangeably, as we have said, 120 days after the solstice; and, when the rising of Sirius corresponded to this solstice, the grand cycle would begin with the succeeding new year. The secret was kept, but the key was preserved. We can find it in the story Plutarch tells of Hermes. Hermes played at dice with Selene (the moon), and won from her five days. Chronos and Netpé (the starry Time and the starry Space), having been privately married, begat five children,—the five Planets. The Sun discovered it, and was enraged; for there was neither Space nor Time for new stars. He cursed Netpé, therefore, saying that her children should be born neither into month nor year. Netpé, in her distress, appealed to Thoth, god of wisdom and of stars. He, having embraced her, played again with the moon, and won from her the seventy-second part of every day in the year of 360 days. Out of these he formed five days, which he threw in at the end of twelve months. In these days, the waiting planets were born; and not only they, but the five gods who live in them, came into the world. Osiris, Typhon, Horus, Isis, and Nepthys came into the world on these days: so the sacred year was made up of the birthdays of the gods,—truly a "divine year"!\*

We have given to Baron Bunsen the blank paper on which he is to draw his chart; namely, the 21,000 years. We will sketch the finished map lightly, according to the natural order of events, rather than to the order of investigation. Before

---

\* This Phoenix cycle, consisting of three periods of 500 years each, must have been founded on the Apis year,—equal to twenty times 360 days; that is, 500 years. This notation was probably an older method than the Sothiac of reaching the same result; and was recognized by the grand multiple of the Apis and Sothiac cycles, which was supposed to produce a grand cosmic year.



entering upon it, one or two things must be fixed in the mind. The first historic king of Egypt is supposed to have reigned about 3,400 years before Christ; but he united under himself twenty-seven different provinces, of a civilization already far advanced. He found, when he ascended the throne, a perfect language, and a ceremonial religion fully developed. His name was Menes, and he stands as the representative of the beginning of history to Egypt. After his time, its history is divided into three parts:—

1. The Old Empire, or the empire of Menes, lasting 1,076 years, and ending with the thirteenth dynasty.

2. The Middle Empire, of Hyksos or shepherd kings, mixed with subordinate native princes, lasting 922 years, and ending with the seventeenth dynasty.

3. The New Empire, a revival of native Egyptian power, which expelled the Hyksos, lasting 1,286 years, and ending with the thirtieth dynasty.\*

It will thus be seen, that the history of Egypt contains the history of thirty different dynasties, or reigning families,—not necessarily Egyptian, only *reigning* in Egypt. Thus, the twenty-eighth dynasty consisted of Cambyses, Darius, and Xerxes, better known in connection with Persia. At first, historians were determined that these dynasties should indicate families reigning in succession: but the truth is, that many of these princes were reigning together; that the royal power of one or another was frequently maintained only in some remote province; and, as to the numbers of the dynasties, they were given arbitrarily, and are no guide whatever to the order of succession. Thus, for example, the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh were all on the throne together; the ninth and tenth being a continuation of the fifth at Heracleapolis, the seventh and eighth at Memphis, and the eleventh at Thebes.

---

\* Written lists of Manetho and Eratosthenes, statements of Herodotus, Diodorus, Apollodorus, and others, two monumental tablets, and several valuable papyrus lists of kings, furnish evidence in relation to these periods, beside that found in pyramids and tombs.

We proceed next to give Bunsen's historical and astronomical checks for the age of the human race.

1. Mankind was created, geographically, on the northern slope of the Hindu Kush, and its continuation to the Taurus and the open Polar Sea, in which the Ural was then an island or a peninsula; the northern part of Europe and Asia not being as yet in existence. The eastern limit was formed by the Chinese Altai; the western, by Ararat and the Caspian Caucasus. From the east flowed the rivers called Oxus and Jaxartes; from the west, the Tigris and Euphrates,—the four rivers of which there is an almost universal tradition.

2. A vast catastrophe by fire and water, which formed the Aral and Caspian Seas, involving a great change of climate, drove them out of it. What had been a delicious country, now became cold and unproductive, or arid from burning heat. That this convulsion created a great change in the distribution of races, the Bible and the Vendidad (one of the books of the Zend) show. In that primeval world there was already high antiquity and a good deal of civilization. Now, we have already explained the period we have allowed for the development of mankind previous to the Deluge. We have stated that in 1248 A.D. our summer gained eight days, and the whole climate of the northern hemisphere was in a favorable condition. In A.D. 6498, the two seasons will be in equilibrium; and in 11,748 the cold season will have gained eight days. If we calculate backward, we shall find that at B.C. 4002 the seasons were in equilibrium; that at B.C. 9252 cold weather and unfavorable conditions reigned; and that the maximum of heat had been reached 19,752 B.C. For this reason, the creation of man has been assigned to the twentieth century before the Christian era; and the Flood, with its attendant catastrophes, to the tenth.

Here we insert a table of conclusions, which seem needed to carry on the story. Before the Deluge, our Scripture tells us, Cain emigrated from Eden. He went toward the East, and became the father of Turanian civilization. Neither the carefully kept books of the Chinese nor the Egyptian records show any knowledge of the Flood: consequently, the races who founded these two civilizations emigrated from

the primal land before the Flood. The Hindoos have long been considered a very ancient race; but this opinion is a mistake: a feud divided them from the main body of the Iranians, commonly called Persians, as late as 6000 B.C. The Zend contains only a record of primeval migrations, founding fourteen kingdoms,—the last in the Punjaub. The ancestral Aryans left Iran proper, “the land of pleasantness,” on account of a great convulsion of nature near the sources of the Oxus and Jaxartes. This was on the slopes of Belur Tagh, between 40° and 37° north latitude, and 89° or 90° east longitude. Two months of summer to ten of winter describes the climate which they left.\* The Zend traces the original catastrophe to water, ice, and upheaval; a part of our Scripture traces it to water only: but we must not forget the flames which guarded the gates of Eden, in the still older story.†

\* From the Vendidad we take the following abbreviated record of their movements:—

1. They went north, to Samarcand, driven by a raging pestilence;
2. To Margiana, where they encountered wars and invading Cossacks;
3. To Bactria, where they found mosquitoes and poisonous plants;
4. To Nisaya, in Northern Parthia, where religious scepticism assailed them;
5. To Herat, where they encountered toil and poverty;
6. To Segestan-Dushak, where schism again assailed them;
7. To Caboul;
8. To Candahar, invaded by the terrible sin of pæderasty, or unnatural lust;
9. To Haraquaiti, where an apostacy, concerning the burial of the dead, occurred;
10. To Hetumat, the classic Etymander, where sorcery prevailed;
11. To Northern Media, where schism began again;
12. To Khorassan, where the profane burning of the dead was introduced;
13. To Verena, or Ghilan, where illness assailed their women;
14. To the Punjaub, where they finally separated into Persians and Hindus.

In Irania, *Ary* meant Lord; in Egypt, it kept the same signification.

† The original seat of Zoroaster was in Bactria, where he ruled after the time of Menes. His Zend was called the Maga; but there was a great difference between his trinity of “thought, word, and deed,” and the corrupted Magism. From the Zend we get a table like this:—

	B.C.
Plutonic disturbance and primeval emigration . . . . .	10,000
Gradual separation into Germans, Slaves, &c. . . . .	8,000
Gradual extension of races, on to . . . . .	5,000
Aryan emigration to the Punjaub . . . . .	4,000
Zoroaster's religious reform . . . . .	3,500
Sanscrit ceased to be a living language . . . . .	1,000

The two great formative branches of the human family show indelible marks of their common origin. The Semitic and Aryan commenced an independent progression at the very moment when Egypt became stationary. The condition of the Egyptians, before their separation from the primeval race, was stereotyped on the Nile. It will be remembered, that the Egyptians were the descendants of Kham or Chem, or, more popularly, Ham. We shall confine ourselves, as far as possible, to the use of the first term.

From this train of thought, and much evidence, which we must pass over until we come to the history of the Hebrews, we come to the following conclusions:—

1. The patriarchal dates were true dates,—astronomic, historic, or geographic,—partly misunderstood by those who recorded them.

2. We can get at the meaning only by penetrating and throwing aside the misconceptions.

3. The Biblical record consists of two versions,—the version of the "Elohim," and the version according to Seth.

4. It begins in a purely ideal statement; but what follows contains reminiscences of thousands of years of primeval life.

5. Hebel, or Abel, the "thing of nought," *vanishing* away, belongs to the ideal sphere. He represents the subjugation of the mild shepherd races by the fierce Kossites,—dwellers in towns,—Turanians descended from Cain.

6. The first epoch in history, therefore, is Turanian, represented in Scripture by the migration of Cain, who went sullenly out to build cities to the east of Eden.

7. Then followed what we may call the Middle Age of that primeval world. Cain left behind him the development of the races. Eastward went the warriors, westward the priests.

8. Then come the descent and predominance of conquering, overbearing Kossite races; its natural result in debauchery; and then the Flood. Great clearness is here thrown into the narrative, by putting the story of Nimrod into its right place,—before the Flood and the dispersion of the Semitic races; and by showing that Nimrod was no Cushite from the South,



but a Koshite, a mountaineer,—a conclusion which the books of the Zend justify.

9. Then came the Flood: of its duration we know nothing certainly.

10. Then came the great Semitic emigration, beginning with Heber, the man who "crossed the river," the ancestor of the Hebrews. This emigration may have originated in antediluvian pressure, exerted by Kossite hordes under Nimrod.

11. Almost all nations have some traditions of the Flood, which retain a wonderful harmony. That of Abraham seems nearest to pure history.

12. Abraham's roots are Aryan.

13. The Semites exerted no influence in Egypt, except through the invading Hyksos.

14. The Egyptians, emigrating before the Flood, had no knowledge of it.

15. Vast hordes of Southern Palestinians, driven out of Egypt 1,700 B.C., were the real Pelasgi; in Semitic, *Pelashet*, or wanderers. They drove the Aryans westward, out of the Greek islands. Perhaps the convulsions which drove the Phœnicians from the five cities near the Dead Sea to the sea-coast, had prepared the way. These emigrations made the channel through which Asiatic ideas were to penetrate the Greek mythology.

From these conclusions, we have the following approximate table of dates:—

I. Creation of man in Northern Asia . . . . .	20,000 B.C.
II. Flood and geological disturbance . . . . .	10,000 „

#### FIRST AGE.

*Antediluvian history. Formation of languages and peoples between the Creation and the Flood.*

I. Sinism (deposited in China) . . . . .	20,000 to 15,000 B.C.
II. Old Turanian (in Tartary) . . . . .	15,000 to 12,000 „
III. Khamism (in Egypt) . . . . .	12,000 to 11,000 „

## SECOND AGE.

*The Flood. Emigration to Egypt.*

- IV. The formation of Semism, and Nimrod's  
     Turanian kingdom . . . . . 10,000 to 7,250 B.C.  
 V. Of Iranism in Persia . . . . . 7,250 to 4,000 „  
 VI. Chaldeeism in Babylon, and Menes in  
     Egypt . . . . . 0,000 to 3,623 „

## THIRD AGE.

- VII. Of Abraham . . . . . from 2,877 to 1,320 B.C.  
     Of Moses . . . . . from 1,320 to 604 „

In the first age, Sinism was first deposited in North China. In its language, every syllable was a word, every word a picture. In its worship, the cosmic agencies and the souls of ancestors were adored.

Turanianism deposited itself in Thibet. Its language, like that of the South-American tribes, was a pure agglutination, from which particles soon originated.

Khamism deposited itself in Egypt. The roots and stems of language were formed, and hieroglyphs began.

Then came the Flood; and, just before it or with it, an emigration of Aryans from the regions of the Oxus and Jaxartes, and of Semites from the Euphrates and Tigris.

In the first period of the second age, the Aryans and Semites separate still farther in Asia; the invasion of Nimrod takes place; a watch-tower is built on the plains of Babylon; and the Aryans move into Bactria.

In the second period of the second age, the Aryans gradually separate into Kelts, Armenians, Iranians, Greeks, Slaves, and Germans. The Northern Semites separate from the Southern, and a central Aryan civilization begins in Asia. The Aryans move to the Indus, the Chaldæans to Babylonia. Zoroaster appears about 3000 B.C. Babylon is built by the son of Belus. Abram is born, and moves toward Mesopotamia.

In the third age, not only does Abraham move into Canaan, but the convulsion in the neighborhood of the Dead

Sea drives the inhabitants of the five cities to the coast; and Tyrian chronology begins, and, by astronomic and other synchronistic points, establishes the era.

In the first period of the second age, Egypt forms its "nomes" or provinces, and the republican power in them comes to an end. They have their first priestly king; and then, in the second period, elective kings for 817 years. Then a double government, and the original worship of the sun develops into three forms,—the worship of Seth, of Ra, and of Ammon.

In the third period of the second age, while Babylon is building, history begins in Egypt. Menes is on the throne, and the whole country under one government. The system of writing changes: the hieroglyph takes on a cursive character, and becomes hieratic. Animal worship begins, and the largest pyramids are built.

In the third age, while the descendants of Abraham are in Canaan, Sesortosis employs Joseph as his "shalith" in Egypt; and, under the pressure of the great famine, the tenure of land is changed throughout Egypt. This put it in the power of the kings to oppress their people. It was according to poetical justice, that, Joseph having advised and consummated this great iniquity, his people, in remote centuries, should smart beneath the power it conferred.

To resume: The first emigration from the Garden is described as moving east; and the emigrants are not shepherds, like Abel, but husbandmen, dwellers in towns. The Turanian language shows the first step; the Khamitic (*i.e.*, the Egyptian), the second. Khamism disappears slowly in Asia; but from the districts about the Euphrates; through Mesopotamia and Palestine, a body of people moved, of whom we know nothing except their language. This language, rediscovered in the "Book of the Dead," speaks to us in syllables that were ancient 4,000 years ago. From this language we discover that the emigration took place before the Flood, and that, by breaking up old ties of race, it opened a new historic consciousness to the emigrants. The shortest line from inorganic language to the organic is through the Chinese, the

Turanian, and the later Semitic. But the history of our Iranian languages carries us back to the remotest periods. When the Aryans separated, they already possessed an orderly system of family life. They tended their flocks, practised husbandry, and their language teemed with philosophic germs, with suggestions of mythology. The whole grammatical structure, the terms for designating all family relations, are common to Bactrians, Indians, Greeks, Slaves, Germans, and Latins. The latest of the grand emigrations was probably that of the Aryans into the Punjab. Their oldest hymns date from 3000 B.C.; but at that time they had a national existence. Between 10,000 and 4000 B.C., a Semitic development was attained, separate from the Egyptian; an Iranian, separate from the Semitic. That is to say, as the Aryan stream moved westward, it deposited itself first as Iranian, then as Semitic, then as Egyptian; but the crystallization of this deposit into prior forms of life and government may have been in the inverse order.

The "Ethiops" of the classics lived beyond Syene, where the Nubians now live. They did not speak the Egyptian language, and were governed by kings controlled by priests, — kings who were the tools of that caste. Between the Tigris and Euphrates lived peaceable Semites. In Palestine was a medley of tribes, nomadic and bandit. Egypt was the granary of the world, and the caravan trade still greater than it is now. The influence of Ethiopia upon her in the middle empire was very great. The wife of Amosis, the founder of the new empire, was an Ethiopian heiress; and, although nothing would seem more certain than that Pharaoh was swallowed up with his hosts, what he really did was to flee to Ethiopia, with his son and his gods, in the panic of the Exodus. The civilizing power came into Egypt from Asia. It went first to Upper Egypt, and thence descended to the Delta. The first emperors were Thinites, who came from Abydos to found Memphis. Theban kings were on the throne at the close of the old empire, and during the whole of the middle empire, or Hyksos usurpation. They form the most brilliant element of the new empire which came after;

•



and we find it reflected in the poems of Homer. Memphis was the focus of the old empire. From the twenty-first dynasty, it was the cradle of royal races. The nations of the old world turned towards the Mediterranean, as plants turn towards the light. Alexandria and the great cities of the Delta began to draw vitality from Asia; and Upper Egypt sank into the shade. Egypt was always the child of both Asia and Africa. In Ethiopia, the priest had the upper hand; in Egypt, the warrior. The king the Theban once chose on the Libyan mountain, as Synesius tells, must have been a priest.

All this was over when Menes came to the throne. Sacerdotal government was the *ultimatum* of Ethiopia. In Egypt, it was only transitional. Only a generation after Joseph made over to the crown the whole fee simple of the country, we find a second Sesortosis building the Labyrinth. When Strabo says that the representatives of each nome, or province, assembled there, at the great festival of the Panegyrics, he transmits its history. At Thebes, every vestige of the early freedom was now destroyed. The independence of the nomes was lost in the gigantic building, the monster of imperial power, that devoured freedom.

The following tables will give a bird's-eye view of the development of Egypt:—

PRIOR TO MENES.

- I. Rule of sacerdotal kings in the Thebaid, Bytis.
- II. Elected kings in the Thebaid. Last Ethiopic constitution.
- III. Hereditary princes. Confederation in two groups. Asiatic influence prevailing.
- IV. Double empire. National civilization.
- V. Predominance of Lower-Egypt and Asiatic ideas.

FROM MENES TO THE LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE.

- I. Unity of empire under the first dynasty.
- II. Decline of the Thinite line, re-action towards Ethiopia, worship of animals becoming national, under the 2d, 3d, and 4th dynasties.

- III. Separation. The 5th (Theban) dynasty gives way to the 6th (Memphite).
- IV. Separation into two governments. Conquered Memphites disappear in the 8th dynasty. The North revolts. At Pelusium, a way is opened for Asia to prevail, when the Sesostriidæ at Thebes become extinct.
- V. The power of the Pharaohs becomes restricted to the Thebaid. They form marriage connections in Ethiopia. In dynasties 13, 14, and 17, the Ethiopian element becomes fixed.
- VI. The Thebans restore the empire. Theban kings reign down to the 20th dynasty.
- VII. A Re-action. The Thebans die out. Princely houses of the Delta, especially the Saite, furnish the kings for the 21st and the 26th dynasty.
- VIII. The Ethiopians dethrone Bochoris the Reformer, and reign fifty years as the 25th dynasty.
- IX. Supremacy of the Asiatic element shows itself throughout the reign of Psammetichus of Sais. Egypt is in friendly relations with Greece. Its great bodies of feudal soldiery are breaking up.
- X. It is subjugated by Persia, and later by Macedonia.

At the risk of seeming repetition, we must give one more tabular view, to indicate the position of Egypt as regards the development of civilization and government. The last table showed what races swayed her, what divisions of races occurred within her own limits. We divide the story now into five epochs, indicated in outline below. Our object is to show, that a very much longer period of time was needed for her development than has been hitherto accorded.

*First Epoch*, 1,500 years. — Egypt's primeval time; the formation of language; the development of the Khamitic character, language, and picture-writing. Latest point, 9500 B.C.

*Second Epoch*, 2,000 years. — Transition period; formation of mythology; age of Egyptian ideographic characters, up to syllableism; development of the worship of Osiris. Latest point, 8000 B.C.

*Third Epoch*, 1,100 years. — Political commencement; for-

mation of the nomes; constitution of districts; formation of a system of phonetics; hieroglyphs, with syllables up to the alphabet. Latest point, 7000 B.C.

*Fourth Epoch*, 1,500 years. — Double government, Upper and Lower Egypt; formation of a constitution and an alphabet. Latest point, 5500 B.C.

*Fifth Epoch*. — This begins with the reign of Menes, in historic order, at 3400 B.C., which gives us a chronology like this: —

Khamism, forming . . . . .	1,500 years.
Osirism and picture-writing . . . . .	1,500 „
Formation of the nomes . . . . .	1,500 „
Consolidation of Upper and Lower Egypt . . . . .	1,500 „
United in religion under Menes . . . . .	<u>3,400</u> B.C.
Which carries history back to . . . . .	9,400 B.C.

This gives us 6,000 years before Menes. It can be proved, that, at his accession, language, manners, and religion had already become rigid. There were, before his time, we are told, 180 generations, which gives us 5,400 years; and we must throw the emigration back of the Flood, of which it preserved no tradition. That it is not an extravagant estimate, we shall see; for Manetho gives 5,212 human princes before Menes. If we throw out the usual proportion of contemporaneous kings, still this period is not too long.

This paper will indicate in what manner, in Bunsen's view, the existence and antiquity of all other Asiatic nations are involved in that of Egypt. It has been impossible to pause to prove the positions taken. The proof is found in following the two subordinate branches of the main inquiry, — the Hebrew chronology, and the history of the Egyptian literature and monuments, in which we have found the chief interest of these volumes. The scheme of the 21,000-years' cycle is illustrated by careful plates, drawn, in accordance with ancient and modern observation, under the direction of a skilful astronomer. The Sothiac festive year, it will be readily acknowledged, was of such importance, that its celebration would always be remembered in connection with

the king reigning at the time of its celebration. If we celebrated the fourth of July only once in a hundred years, of course the President in office at the time would become prominent. There must be 1,461 years between any two reigns in which such an event occurred: so we have a regulator for the internal chronology. A careless reader might find no proof of the assertion, that Nimrod was a Kossite, or mountaineer of the Caucasus. The proof is mixed in with the philological investigations, and is to be found in the enumerations of the Zend. .

The reader who has attempted Bunsen, and given up its perusal in despair, may doubt the fairness of any exposition of his work which seems to run smoothly. It seems proper, then, to indicate in what manner this paper has been prepared. It is based upon the conclusions of the first four volumes of "*Egypt's Place in History*," carefully studied out and compared. Whatever changes are suggested (if any) in the fifth volume are to be further treated by themselves; for that part of it which does not consist of Egyptian remains is merely a summing-up of results. In this reduction, we have thrown out all technical learning not essential to the reader's comprehension of the subject. Learning, necessary to Bunsen's own preparation for his work, is frequently bewildering to the student, who looks chiefly for results. We have also suppressed all variations in the spelling, which grow out of philological habits. Common readers are puzzled when Ham suddenly becomes Chem; or Iranian, Aryan. As Bunsen's work was gradual, and his inquiry progressive, dates are assumed in his first volume, which are slightly changed in the fourth. He has a way, too, of mentioning dates, sometimes in a specific and sometimes in an approximate way, which is puzzling. Thus he sometimes speaks of the culmination of favorable influences, in the thirteenth century of our era, as having occurred in 1240, sometimes as in 1248. Such variations as arise from the development of his work have a real value in the book itself, because they show when and how his conclusions are affected; but they have no such value to the general reader. They only confuse him with



their uncertainty. We adhere, therefore, to the specific dates.

It is not likely that we have been able to assume these changes without making some mistakes; but better incur the blame of that, than permit this magnificent work to be wholly obscured and hidden by inconsistencies so trivial.

---

ART. V.—JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN CHARITY.

*London Pauperism amongst Jews and Christians.* An Inquiry into the Principles and Practice of Out-door Relief in the Metropolis, and the Results upon the Moral and Physical Condition of the Pauper Class. By J. H. STALLARD, M.B., London. London: Saunders, Otley, & Co., 1867.

THE Jewish system of public relief in London originated, it seems, from the removal, a few years ago, of the wealthier Hebrew families, for fashion's sake, to the West End. Before this removal, the rich and poor not only met together in their synagogues for common worship and mutual edification, but lived together in a common and close neighborhood, with natural relations between the two classes, and a simple, spontaneous dependence of each upon the other. Left to themselves, the poor were obliged to resort to new means of communication with their more favored fellows of Israel's name. "*All isolation,*" says Matthew Browne, in his own italics, "*all isolation is a making of little hells!*" So it wrought with the Hebrews in the great metropolis. The poorer synagogues of the Continent forwarded their dependent members, for relief, to London, as their residence, or as a stage on their way, pilgrim-like, to our shores. Hundreds of poor foreigners, ignorant of the language, homeless and houseless, with no means of self-support, crowded the Jewish quarter in the heart of this centre of the world's wealth. The Hebrew population was estimated, last year, at 55,000, and has not, probably, ranged much below those figures during the brief

period of their new Relief Arrangement. The foreign element largely predominated. Some estimate of the proportion of widows and fatherless children may be drawn from the fact, that 10,000 of the former and 25,000 of the latter are already enrolled upon the books of their Guardians of the Poor.

The removal of the rich from their vicinity left the poor to avail themselves of begging pleas or begging letters. They planted themselves at the doors of warehouses, counting-rooms, or banking-offices, with an importunity not to be denied; or they forwarded epistles of a most urgent and piteous tenor: and to both forms of appeal the pious and prosperous Jew promptly accorded a favorable reply. So the relationship was re-established, which his removal to the West End had disturbed. But effects soon followed which revealed a disastrous error. The more the rich yielded and gave, the more importunate and exacting the poor became. Beggars' cries and beggars' letters multiplied and swarmed, like the flies and frogs of Egypt. Pauperism increased. To prevent this, as well as to remember and relieve the poor, was the question which Hebrew charity had to meet.

The first step was the appointment of a Board of twenty-nine Guardians of the Poor, to represent the conference of the three synagogues of the city and the wealth of their communion. This Board was subdivided into general branches of inquiry and relief, with special departments for strangers, for widows and orphans, for the sick, the unemployed, &c. They provided also for a corps of additional volunteers, in case of epidemics or unusual calls for aid. Nor were the Guardians to be mere officials or hirelings. The wisest and best of their people volunteered, or were selected, for the sacred service. It was a religious trust; and its representatives and agents were called to it, or called for it, "in God." There was to be no longer isolation, separation, estrangement; but, rather, proximity, union, friendship.

Again, in opening their office, in receiving and visiting the applicants for relief, the same personal element of religion and humanity appears. The poor were invited, encouraged, urged to come, *before* they became beggars or paupers, and

lest they should become such. With all the respect shown for the home and the person of the poor brother or sister, the wholesome sanitary faith of the Hebrew Guardians never allowed an applicant to appear with unclean hands, face, or body, or to remain in an unclean tenement. Bath-tickets were ready for the first, and another house, or suite of rooms, for the last, at the expense of the Guardians; who insisted upon the use of these tickets, and removal to suitable apartments, before affording any other relief. The Guardians challenge the most jealous and vigilant scrutiny to discover a single instance of their overlooking, neglecting, or failing to relieve, a worthy poor individual or family. Not that they always give. But full records are kept in every case; and the Board can prove from their books, that, if they did not yield at times to the request of the poor, it was because a better course suggested itself,—a better method, at once, of removing want and of preventing pauperism. The best proof that this is well done we find in the report, so honorable to the Jewish Guardians, that, whenever the poor are thus denied their request, or, rather, are put in the way of helping themselves, they are as well pleased as if the alms had been bestowed. In other words, the treatment they receive is so straightforward and sincere, that they see, with the Guardians, how much better it is to look elsewhere, to resources of their own or of their friends and kindred, than to draw upon official charity-funds. If a journey or voyage should be proposed, the Guardians cheerfully give or loan the necessary means. Often they add enough to prevent anxiety or suffering when the poor arrive whither they recommend them to remove: this, we believe, is their rule in every worthy instance. And many a freshly-arrived and hardly-pressed foreigner—exile and wanderer on the earth—has found reason to rejoice in the prompt and provident, brotherly and paternal, kindness of his “co-religionists,” as they style themselves so justly. But, when the Guardians find that the applicants must remain where they are, if their investigations reveal real merit and real want, aid to any needed amount is forthcoming at once.

They meet the applicant at first with a welcome. They believe every story which is at all probable, till facts oblige them to set it aside; and, in all instances, when no other alternative is left, their charity flows towards the worthy poor in swift, sure, and swelling streams. No further time is to be lost; and the only rule or measure to be applied is that of the necessity of the case. They do not ask, How little can you get along with? They do not adopt a fixed rate for every recipient; nor are they guilty of the folly of setting some narrow bound, within which the poor must content themselves, or go to the *almshouse*. They know nothing of the miserable policy which views the poor with suspicion and aversion, doles out scanty alms to those who beg the loudest or deceive the most, and too often overlooks the honest and humble sufferers, who had rather perish than mix with beggars and rank with paupers. "I dread giving the first half-dollar," said an overseer, once, in Baltimore. "Make it five or ten dollars; and tell the poor creature, to whom it yields substantial relief, to look to you, and to you alone, under God, when it is gone, if the occasion for it remains," would be the Hebrew reply, "and you will have nothing to fear." A widow cries, "I must break up my family: I cannot keep my children together. My husband is gone: our little ones are so many, I must send them to the asylum, or let strangers adopt them."—"No," say the Guardians: "God is your husband; your offspring are our wards; their mother's side is the best asylum; no home is so good as yours for them." "But," she pleads, "how can I afford it?"—"What will it cost?"—"A pound sterling, it may be, a week."—"We will gladly find that for you," is their reply. This condition, however, is always insisted upon,— "Your children must attend school." The mother cheerfully consents and faithfully complies. The schools are free, and, when school-going days are over, the best of places are found for their "wards;" and the Guardians continue to watch over them with parental solicitude and affection, till, at a suitable age, they are received into the synagogue. Many a fatherless child rises, in this way, to eminence and usefulness in the future adminis-



tration of the faith and humanity of his fathers, or takes her honored and happy place among the daughters of Israel.

Not merely children, but every young man and young woman, is made to partake of this all-embracing guardianship of the Hebrew system. An important additional means of relief comes in the form of loans under five pounds (twenty-five or thirty dollars), without interest, and of larger loans at fair rates. The loan-offices are governed by the rules in Deuteronomy, and resemble our pawners' bank, and the *monts de piété* of Europe. Marriage portions, gratuities to the poor for festive occasions, and burial grants, are common everywhere with "the chosen people." One touching feature they can proudly claim as their own: when a woman is about to become a mother, no matter how humble or little known she may be, her neighbors congratulate her on God's great goodness, assure her of their sympathy, and pledge, with words never known to be broken, whatever cheer or succor she may require. The consequence is, more children are favorably ushered into the world, and, from this and kindred care afterwards, a larger proportion of infants reach the age of five in health and strength, with this "peculiar people," than with any others upon the globe. Similar pains produce equal advantages upon the general duration of mature life with the Hebrews.

One person weekly, Dr. Stallard estimates, dies of starvation in London! Such a thing is wholly unknown under the Jewish administration; while imposture, beggary, crime from the pressure of want, and pauperism in all its forms, are effectually prevented. Sub-committees have special charge of the sick, infirm, aged, and "casual" poor. They forbid and prevent all resort to almshouses, workhouses, or the like; and, though their own charities are extended to all the dispensaries, hospitals, and benevolent institutions of Christian London, yet they prefer their own provisions for their own dependents. Old age is held in especial esteem. None of the natural shocks that flesh is heir to, appear to be uncared for.

Especially grateful are their arrangements for the sick.

Medical men, and their allies of the volunteer committee, are always ready. Not only drugs, medicines, wines, and cordials are supplied, but all the nameless necessary appurtenances of the hospital or sick-chamber. All common calls are sure of prompt and effectual attention; while in case of epidemics, like Asiatic cholera, the latent organizing force is sufficient to cover the field at once with nurses, watchers, or assistants, with special supplies in ample variety and abundance. The Baroness of Rothschild provides, at her own expense, a sick-kitchen, to furnish food to fifty poor patients every day. A graduated pupil of the girls' free Hebrew schools is chief cook. Under her are sixteen other young Jewesses, training in turn for future skill and usefulness. In the morning, the physician sends in his orders for beef-tea, broth, arrow-root, jelly, or whatever the sick, the convalescent, the feeble, or any under his treatment, require; which is issued in due time, whatever it may be. The cost is considerable, and so is the effect. "Better give up some of our dispensaries," says Dr. Stallard, "and open sick-kitchens instead." And every one who has had occasion to lament the want of wholesome and suitable food, more than even of medicine, for the sick poor, must agree with him as to the importance of our borrowing this admirable feature, which the Baroness conducts with a generous heart and an open purse.

To sum up, in closing, a few leading features of the system: First, it is one of *personal devotion* to the well-being of man and the highest interests of society. The Jewish Guardians of the Poor are drawn from their most influential and intelligent members. Men and women of the best culture, ability, and rank gladly volunteer their services as principals or assistants.

Next, the whole spirit is that of *confidence and respect*, as well as of affection, towards the claimant of their bounty. However lowly, however poor, he is, still they cheerfully confess the equal, the neighbor and brother, of the lofty and the rich. He must be so received and so treated as not to lose sight of this himself. The crowning aim is to preserve and

strengthen the sentiment of self-respect. Despondency or despair, even any approach to undue self-distrust and self-depreciation, destroys the best hope of human peace and improvement.

Again, the whole plan is grounded upon a religious faith in "the God of their fathers." Rich and poor alike depend on that Will which at once divides and unites them. So they can live and work together in humility and in hope, neither unduly exalted nor unduly depressed. One God, one Law, one Love, — admit that, and every thing else follows of itself.

The Ministry at Large in Boston has, for more than forty years, been pursuing a series of measures closely resembling those here described. This mission, inspired by the eloquence of Channing and sustained by the labors of Tuckerman, was pre-eminently due to the practical piety and philanthropy of Henry Ware. As pastor of the church in Hanover Street, and a resident of that section of the city, he yearned to render his ministry serviceable to the poor not enrolled in his or in any of our parishes. They passed him daily in the streets; they toiled and rested, suffered and sinned, perchance, beneath the shadow of his church-walls,—alas! only a shade upon their path. His own flock sufficed not for his sacred charge. Here were neighbors to be loved and served and saved, as himself and as his own. With a noble band of young men and women to second his endeavors, he established the Ministry at Large. Two years later, Dr. Tuckerman entered the field with a zeal and devotion which have secured for him the credit that was really due to Mr. Ware. From its commencement to the present hour, the aim has been to introduce into the charities of Boston, and of every place provided with this ministry, all the best features of the Hebrew system in the great metropolis. The visits from house to house; the bounties of the poor's purse; the chapel movements, with all their schools and services; the two leading branches of the "Society for the Prevention of Pauperism" and the "Provident Association," with the network of complementary and subsidiary instrumentalities introduced by the Ministry at Large, or yet to

spring from it, — these give an outline of what we trust may be combined hereafter in a well-arranged and amply endowed and amended Poor-law Administration, not for this city alone, but ultimately for our whole country.

---

ART. VI. — WOMAN IN PUBLIC LIFE.

*The College, the Market, and the Court.* By CAROLINE H. DALL.  
Boston: Lee & Shepard.

THIS volume, as a recent, interesting, and cogent statement of the practical questions affecting the author's own rights and position, as one of the class she represents, has, in the discussion, a value which we can claim for no remarks of ours. Wholly agreeing with most of her arguments and deductions, regarded from her point of view, there is, however, a province of the discussion to which she has not given all the attention to which we think it entitled; and it is as to this that we shall offer most of the following remarks. Naturally enough, her book assumes the old ground of antagonism or disparity between the sexes, rather than the absolute ground of unprejudiced reason and impartial right. There is, we must confess, too much reason for this. Woman is still too generally regarded, on account of the transmitted opinions and usages of the past, as a mere appendage to man. Now, the truth of the greatest importance to be considered is, that the element of *humanity*, not the element of *sex*, is the supreme fact by which the question should be determined. And the emphasis here given to one side in this discussion is the legitimate reply to an unjust and cruel prejudice on the other side. Seen from the point of view of absolute morality, man is no more a child of God and an heir of the eternal universe, than woman. She has a personal destiny of her own to fulfil, irrespective of him; just as much as he has one, irrespective of her. If, as a woman, she looks up to him, he, as a man, looks up to her; but as human



beings, with nature, society, and fate before them, they both look up to God, whether together or separately. "The most important duty of woman," it has been said, "is to perfect man." Why so? No one would say that the most important duty of man is to perfect woman. And yet, why is it not just as much his duty to be her servant, as it is her duty to be his servant? It is a remnant of barbaric prejudice, preserved from the ages of brute force, which makes the difference in the estimate. The first duty of every human being is self-perfection. The ideal of marriage is the mutual perfection of both parties. In its truest idea, marriage is an institution for the perfecting of the race, by the perfecting of individual men and women through their co-operating intelligence and affection. To limit its end to the perfecting of the man alone, is the highest stretch of masculine arrogance. Is it not a just inference, that, if woman is as completely a human unit as man, she has an equal right with him to the use of every means of self-development in the fulfilment of her destiny? The foremost claim to be made in behalf of women, therefore, is liberty,—as untrammelled a choice of occupation and mode of life, as free a range of individuality and spiritual fruition, as is granted to men.

But would this really be an advance, or a retrogression? Many maintain that it would be subversive of the genuine progress of civilization, to abandon the prejudices and throw down the bars which have hitherto restrained women from a full share in the chosen avocations and ambitions of men. All improvement is marked, they say, by an increase of differences, greater separation and complexity of offices. Therefore, to efface or lessen the social distinctions between the sexes would be to reverse the order of development. Auguste Comte, who felt a strong interest in this subject, and had a deep insight into some of its data, says, "All history assures us, that, with the growth of society, the peculiar features of each sex have become not less but more distinct. Woman may persuade, advise, judge; but she should not command. By rivalry in the selfish pursuits of life, mutual affection between the sexes would be corrupted at its source.

There is a visible tendency towards the removal of women, wherever it is possible, from all industrial occupations. Christianity has taken from them the priestly functions they held under Polytheism. With the decline of the principle of caste, they are more rigidly excluded from royalty and every kind of political authority. Thus their life, instead of becoming independent of the Family, is becoming more concentrated in it. That Man should provide for Woman is a law of the human race,—a law connected with the essentially domestic character of female life.”

There is a larger admixture of error in the foregoing representation, than is usual with this deep and original thinker on social ethics. On this point, the conventional masculine prejudices retained a sway very strange in his case. Let us see what the truth is. It is true that differences increase with the progress of society; it is also true that similarity increases. There is both a minuter subdivision of functions, and a wider freedom of choice in the selection of their functions, by individuals. In the rudest state, the relative condition and mode of life of whole classes are rigidly fixed by their birth or by arbitrary violence. As science and art are developed, and wealth accumulated, the varieties of industry and of social rank are largely multiplied; and liberty of choice is extended, and facility of change is increased. Once there was a royal caste, a priestly caste, a warrior caste, a servile caste, determined by blood, and unalterable. These invidious castes are now, for the most part, broken down, and their several functions comparatively open to all who, observing the conditions, choose to fulfil them. The most prevalent and obstinate of caste distinctions is that of sex; the monopoly by man of public action, power, and honor; the exclusion of one-half of our race from what men regard as the highest social prerogatives,—an exclusion which was no deliberate act, but a natural result of historic causes. This usurpation, or rather development, so organized by immemorial usage as to have become a second nature in both parties, is at last beginning to reveal its injustice, and to give way. In savage life, a woman is little

more than a bearer of burdens, a slave, and a drudge; as coarse as man, and lower in rank and treatment. The man fishes, hunts, fights, plays, rests; putting every repulsive task exclusively on the woman. It is the brute right of the stronger, which very slowly yields to the refining influence of reflective sympathy.

With each successive advance of society, it is not true that the distinction of sex becomes more definite and more important; but it is true that the distinctive feeling of men towards women becomes less a feeling of scorn and authority, more a feeling of deference and homage. Woman is as distinct from man in the grossest barbarism as in the finest civility: only, in that, she is the degraded servant of his senses; in this, she is the honored companion of his soul. If, with the historic progress of society, the sphere of feminine life becomes more domestic, inward, individual, so does that of man too. His ideal life constantly encroaches more on his active life; his physical energies become less predominant, his moral sympathies more so.

Such is the lesson which history yields to him who impartially surveys it. Woman begins by being totally distinct from man in personality and estate, totally subjected to him in service; and goes on, with the improvement of civilization, to be ever freer from his authority, nearer his equal in status, more closely blended with him in personality and moral pursuits. Men and women ascend or sink together, and should share in common every earthly privilege, every heavenly aspiration. They are not, in any proper sense, master and servant; but equals, responsible to one another for mutual perfection, each responsible to God for personal perfection. Therefore, while to efface the intrinsic characteristics of the sexes would undoubtedly be a retrograde step, it is an impossible step, which no one proposes to take. It is proposed merely to efface those factitious characteristics whose removal will clear away barriers and secure the more rapid improvement of all, by blending their culture, their liberty, and their worship, — showing us men and women as equal units of humanity in its personal ends, but dependent coadjutors in its social means.

The common destiny of a woman, as a representative of humanity, is the same as that of a man; namely, the perfect development of her being in the knowledge of truth and the practice of virtue and piety. Her peculiar destiny, as a woman, is wifedom and maternity. But if she declines this peculiar destiny of her sex, or it is denied her, still her common human destiny remains unforfeited; and she has as clear a right to the most unrestricted use of every means of fulfilling it, as she could have if she were a man. Let any one attempt to give a satisfactory reason for the contrary opinion, and he will find that it rests on nothing but unthinking prejudice.

The good wife and mother fulfils a beautiful and sublime office, — the fittest and happiest office she can fulfil. If her domestic cares occupy and satisfy her faculties, it is a fortunate adjustment; and it is right that her husband should relieve her of the duty of providing for her subsistence. But what shall be said of those millions of women who are not wives and mothers, who have no adequate domestic life, no genial private occupation or support? What reason can be given why they should not enjoy the same freedom as men, to earn their own livelihood, take care of themselves, do good, win position, by any avocation for which they are fitted? Victoria is not blamed for being Queen of England, Ristori for occupying the tragic stage, Jenny Lind for singing in public, Rosa Bonheur for painting matchless pictures, Jean Ingelow for writing sweet poems, Dorothy Dix for planting great trophies of her philanthropic labors in many nations.

these illustrious examples of women, in public offices of honor, emolument, beneficence, are admired, not considered as having unsexed themselves, what becomes of the reasoning, that no woman is truly feminine who leaves the domestic sphere?

There are multitudes of women with too much self-respect to be willing to be supported in idleness by men; with too much genius and ambition to be content to spend their lives in trifles; with too much devotedness not to burn to be doing their share in the relief of humanity, the work and progress



of the world. If these were all happy wives and mothers, that might be best. But denied that function, and being what they are, why should not all the provinces of public labor and usefulness, which they are capable of occupying, be freely open to them? What else is it save prejudice that eagerly applauds a woman dancing a ballet or performing an opera, but shrinks with disgust from one delivering an oration, preaching a sermon, or casting a vote? Why is it less womanly to prescribe as a physician, than to tend as a nurse? If a woman have a calling to medicine, divinity, law, literature, art, instruction, trade, or honorable handicraft, it is hard to see any sound reason why she should not have a fair chance to pursue it. Of course, such must ever be the exceptional callings of women; but, in proportion as those not otherwise more satisfactorily employed enter into them, we must believe that the burden on men, instead of being aggravated by the new competition, will be shared, and thus lightened, and the best interests of society receive impulse. These are the simplest commonplaces of the subject. It would be an affront to any unprejudiced mind to suppose them in need of argument. They are well put and amply illustrated in the volume to which we have referred.

But it is necessary to see more clearly the grounds on which women, as a class, have hitherto been excluded from public activity and authority, in order properly to understand the justice or the injustice of that exclusion; and, in studying the origin of customs and opinions now prevalent, it is as much our right to do it with freedom, as it is our duty to do it with reverence. Many persons forget that the highest question is, What ought to be? and not, What has been or is? Usages frequently endure after their utility has ceased, after their propriety has gone. The true ideal of human conduct is not to be found in the imperfections of the past, but to be constructed from the perfections of the future. The fact that a thing has always been, is an historic justification of it for bygone time, but not a moral justification of it for coming time. This requires intrinsic and enduring reasons, — reasons of right and use. While the exclusion of

women from public life has been perfectly natural in the ages behind us, it is a distinct inquiry whether such an exclusion • be either obligatory or expedient now.

All history demonstrates the law, that the male sex has greater muscular strength, with its natural accompaniments, than the female. The more differentiated and largely supplied nervous structure, connected with the offices of maternity, detracts so much from the amount of force furnished for the muscles and the will. In the rudeness of the primitive state, it is an unavoidable result of the superior muscular power of man that woman is his subject. But the more pronounced nervous system of woman gives her certain spiritual advantages. Her greater sensibility; her greater seclusion, with its relative stimulus of solitude and meditation; the closer endearments of maternity, — develop her affections in a higher degree than his. Hence arises a tendency to refinement, elevation, influence, on her part, — a tendency to which, in proportion to his moral susceptibility, he responds with sympathy, respect, and veneration. Every step of social progress has been marked by a softening of the tyranny of man and a lifting of the position of woman, — an approximation towards an equal companionship. First the tool of his will, next the toy of his pleasure, then the minister of his vanity, she is at last to become the free sharer of his life, the friend of his mind and heart. In the first of these stages, no question of right was consciously raised: the brute preponderance of strength decided all. In the last stage, there will be no question in debate, no exercise of executive authority on either side; all being settled by a spontaneous harmony of privileges and renunciations on both sides. But in the intermediate stages, covering the whole historic period thus far, man has sought, by crude or elaborate reasoning, to justify himself in monopolizing authority, and holding woman subject to the laws he imposes.

The first argument of the master was the argument, prompted by the unneutralized, uneducated, selfish instincts, — that the mere possession of power to rule, gives the right to rule. Might makes right. Muscular superiority is, by intrinsic fit-

ness and necessity, divinely installed to reign. Woman, as "the weaker vessel," must obey. Such a mode of thought was unavoidable, and had its legitimate ages of sway. But no moralist would dream of adopting it after the conscience has advanced to the stage of general principles, has risen into the region of disinterested sympathy or justice. No one would now consciously employ this argument to maintain the subjection of women; yet in multitudes, below the stratum of their conscious thoughts, it blindly upholds that subjection to-day. A single consideration is enough to show the logical absurdity of the assumption. If men are entitled to the exclusive enjoyment of political privileges, simply because they have more physical might, then, by the same principle, among men themselves the weak should be subject to the strong. But the very purpose of law, the moral essence of civilization, is to rectify the natural domination of strength, displacing its sway with spiritual superiority, and bringing all before a common standard.

The argument from intellectual inferiority is as vacant as that from muscular inferiority. In the first place, it is an open question whether women, as a whole, *are* inferior in mind to men. Many intelligent judges firmly believe, that, taken as a whole, they are superior. Cornelius Agrippa wrote a book in 1509, entitled "The Nobility of the Female Sex, and the Superiority of Woman over Man." Lucretia Marinella published a book at Venice, in 1601, undertaking to prove the superiority of her sex to the other. A book entitled "La Femme G n reuse," an attempt to demonstrate "that the women are more noble, more polite, more courageous, more knowing, more virtuous, and better managers than the men," was published at Paris in 1643. Madame Guillaume also published at Paris, in 1665, a work called "Les Dames Illustres," devoted to the proof of the proposition that the female sex surpasses the masculine in all kinds of valuable qualifications. Mrs. F rnham devotes her book, "Woman and her Era," published in New York in 1864, to the support of the same thesis, with new arguments and illustrations. That woman is intellectually superior to man, was likewise the

opinion of Schopenhauer, an exceedingly strong and independent thinker. The supreme examples of genius have indeed been furnished by men; but this is no disproof of the opinion, that the *average* height and quickness of feminine mentality are above the masculine average.

Granting, however, that women have less spiritual force than men, they certainly have greater fineness. Their smaller volume of power is compensated by their greater delicacy and tact, their more sensitive moral capacity. The power of self-sacrifice is surely higher than the power of self-assertion. The examples of queens, from Semiramis to Domna, from Zenobia to Catherine; of philosophers and scholars, like Theano, Hypatia, and Olympia Morata; of foundresses of orders and institutions, organizers and leaders of great enterprises, like Chantal; of actresses, like Mrs. Siddons; of singers, like Malibran; of scientists, like Mrs. Somerville; of heroines, like Charlotte Corday and Joan of Arc; of mystic prophetesses, like Krüdener; of religious thinkers, like Sara Hennell; of novelists, like Madame Dudevant and Marian Evans; of artists, teachers, martyrs, saints, — a host whose faces shine on us out of history, — have abundantly vindicated for their sex, so far as force of will, intellect, imagination, and passion is concerned, the right of eminent domain in the whole empire of human experience.

Besides, admitting the courage, knowledge, skill, and energy of average men to be greater than those of average women, the difference in their respective opportunities and training goes far towards explaining it. Women, as a class, have been excluded from a thousand lists and a thousand stimulants, under whose influences men have been sedulously educated. And, finally, even if we confess the hopeless inferiority of woman to man in some of the highest departments of action, that is no reason for denying her the chance to go as far as she can. If her mental victories must be lower and narrower than his, still, and all the more for her keener need, she should enjoy the stimulus of the struggle, as one means of aiding the fulfilment of her human destiny. Because one can do more than another, shall he compel the other to do nothing?



When the untenableness of muscular or mental power, as a ground for holding women in an inferior position, becomes obvious, man seeks some other argument to justify that usurpation. The next support he conceives for his exclusive appropriation of authority, is the belief that he is exclusively the representative and vicegerent of God on earth; that woman is placed in subordination to him by the direct command of God. In the Hindu law we read, "The husband of a woman is her deity;" and in the Râmâyana, "A husband is the god of his consort." The New Testament says, "Man is the head of the woman, but the head of the man is God;" "Man is the glory of God, but woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man." The Apostle likewise declares, "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve." This position of the Apostle was based on the Hebrew account of the creation of the first woman from a rib of the first man, and of the sentence of God upon her in consequence of her sin in eating the apple: "Thou shalt be subject to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Few persons have a conception of the extent to which this representation, at once supporting itself by the unquestionable voice of a supposed supernatural revelation and allying itself with the most obstinate prejudices of mankind, has moulded the opinions and feelings of the Christian world on the subject before us. But the following paragraph, cited from an English review article, marked by high sentiment and great ability, will serve to illustrate it:—

"Obedience is the proper perfection of humanity; and that obedience and consequent perfection are likely to be frequent and complete in proportion as the object to which submission is to be given is near and comprehensible. Remote and incomprehensible Deity is the head of the man; and his obedience to that vast and invisible authority, though of a loftier nature, is necessarily incomplete in its character and indistinct in its expression, when compared with the submission of the woman to the image of that authority in him. While the one obeys from faith, the other obeys from sight. The light of her duty

strikes directly upon that to which it is relative, and is reflected back in loveliness upon herself; while his appears to be lost in the space it has to traverse to its object. Here is a great spiritual distinction of sex, which those who reject the doctrine of subordination confound and destroy; pulling down the majesty of man by abolishing his principal responsibility, and turning the peculiar strength and glory of the woman into weakness and disgrace."

The foregoing passage is an accurate transcript of the common view as to the moral relation of the sexes. The origin of that view is obvious: the selfish desire of the stronger for homage, and the willingness of the weaker to reflect that desire in their conduct. Is it a sound view? Or is it a fallacy and a superstition? It is neither wholly the one nor the other: it is a disguised and perverted mixture of truth and error. For those who believe in the infallibility of every word of Scripture, the subject is taken out of the province of natural reason, conscience, and expediency; and there is nothing to be said. They hold by the current tradition as the explicit will of God. But, at the present day, there is an increasing proportion of persons who look on the Hebrew narrative of the origin and earliest experience of our race in the garden of Eden, as a legend, similar to kindred narratives in other literatures. They are led, by teachings of philosophy and science which they cannot resist, to the conclusion, that the Almighty did not produce the human species by an arbitrary and wholly exceptional interposition; but created them just as he did the other species, — by a law of development. It seems to them irrational and incredible, that man and woman were made separately, in succession, — the latter exclusively for the former. They are obliged to suppose that man and woman were created simultaneously, — the differentiation of sex having gone on in the lower types for incomputable ages, causing humanity to appear in its earliest rise as male and female. So, instead of saying, "The man was not made for the woman, but the woman for the man," they would affirm, "The man and the woman were equally made for each other, to advance hand in hand to perfection." Those

who assume this scientific point of view, will see that the question of the rights of woman, and her true relation to man, is not to be decided by a myth transmitted from prehistoric times, by any notion of her prior or posterior creation, by any prejudices or usages of the past or present; but purely by a philosophical mastery of the expediency and inexpediency, the essential right and wrong, in the facts of the case.

Looking at the facts in such a light, is it not clear that the sweeping doctrine of female subordination, the subjection of half the human race, is a merely provisional doctrine, a temporary necessity in the progressive evolution of society? Who can, seriously, after having thought on the subject honestly for himself, defend the assertion, that it is "the principal majesty and responsibility of man" to arrogate authority and govern woman? Is it not even ludicrous to assert, that "the peculiar glory of woman" is to revere and obey man? The genuine responsibility and glory alike of man and woman are to reverence and love and serve each other, for the perfection of the natures of both, in a common obedience to God. The question of the eligibility of woman to public life and political prerogatives has nothing to do with her comparative personal weakness; nothing to do with any supposed rule, given in an ancient revelation, adapted to the time when it was given, but not to the more advanced times which are to obey a newer and fuller revelation; nothing to do with any supposition that man was the first to be created and the second to sin, woman the second to be created and the first to sin. The question can be understood only by a correct perception of the will of God, as indicated in the nature and destiny of progressive humanity composed of male and female.

What, then, is the will of God so indicated? Regarded as the two halves of humanity, men and women are alike and equal. Their unlikeness, when regarded as male and female, cannot destroy this primary and fundamental equality, or vitiate any of the rights it involves. Consequently, whatever belongs to humanity proper, belongs equally to men and to women. Woman has an equal claim with man to the fruition

of every thing permanently connected with the fulfilment of the human destiny; that is, the full and harmonious exercise of the faculties of human nature. The division into male and female, affecting not their equality of rights, merely gives special fitnesses and duties to each. Unquestionably, the higher nervous development and maternal offices of woman relatively fit her for tenderness and domesticity; the coarser muscular development and adventurousness of man relatively fit him for hardihood and publicity. But this can furnish no ground for subjecting one, and enthroning the other. It is a reason for their equal co-operation in assimilating each other's best qualities for their mutual and common perfection. Every thing that is good should be granted to both; whatever is evil should be sought by neither.

The true social desideratum at last is, not that women, equally with men, assume the exercise of authority; but that men, equally with women, forego the exercise of authority. The genuine perfection of humanity, instead of being the enforced obedience of one half to the other half, is the spontaneous obedience of both halves to the law of God. The incomplete statement of Paul, "I suffer not a woman to usurp authority," is supplemented by the far deeper word of Christ, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." This is the ideal of the future,—that man shall no more have authority to command than woman, everybody doing right voluntarily, under the intrinsic sway of morality. Politics is the reign of force by legislative sanctions; morality is the reign of affection by social sanctions. The latter is pre-eminently the sphere of woman. Is it her sole sphere, or is she also called to enter the other sphere?

One thing is clear; namely, that it is unjust for the laws to discriminate against women on account of their actual exclusion from political power. They ought to have the same legal rights as men to earn, hold, and control property. Since they



have the same interest as man in the laws they live under, they are entitled, in some way, either by their own voice or through others, to the same consideration in the framing and execution of those laws. Shall we go still further, and say that they ought to take an equal part with men in the caucus, at the ballot-box, in the senate, at the bar, on the bench, and elsewhere? If universal suffrage be the true theory of government, then, logically, women are entitled to vote; because they, equally with men, represent humanity. Every asserted disqualification, on the ground of ignorance or pre-occupation, is sophistical; because the same plea would disqualify four-fifths of the men too. If a government of all by all, be the true theory, it is a wrong to exclude women. If they are not fully qualified, they ought to become qualified; and the only way to qualify them is to confess their claim and begin their education. Either all should vote, or merely those who are fitted: if merely those who are fitted, then thousands of men would be shut out, thousands of women admitted.

The plea for the admission of women to political activity is often met by the assertion, that they do not themselves wish it; that the best women revolt with profound distaste from every thing of the sort. But is this distaste a veracious instinct? or is it a prejudice owing to the ideal of feminine character and life, which they have always been educated to admire? Men have coveted a monopoly of executive power, and held up passive obedience as the fittest type of womanliness. Women, as a general rule, naturally partake the prejudices, and like to flatter the pride and vanity, of the stronger sex. The question is not, What do women desire? but, What ought they to desire? What is right and best for them? The question must be decided by its inherent merits, not by any thing extrinsic or accidental, any prejudices or fortuitous associations. No opinion should be accepted on account of the attractiveness of its advocates, or rejected because those who support it are repulsive to us.

Every measure of intrinsic justice should also be sustained despite of the incidental evils which may be feared. For instance, the opinion that women would be demoralized by

voting is no reason for withholding that right from them, if it be a right. To become egotistic, clamorous, corrupt, and brazen is not a necessary accompaniment of political life; but is the personal fault of those who become so, and just as much a vice in men as in women, just as good a reason for recalling those from the ballot-box, as for withholding these. A multitude of women, illustrious for their commanding public position and influence, have been the purest models of modesty, wisdom, grace, tenderness, and fidelity to every domestic tie.

There is no incompatibility between the different grades and realms of duty or of privilege: narrower and wider, higher and lower, nearer and remoter, — all can be harmonized and duly observed. Those who fail, fail by their own defects. Every kind of action, every station, has its peculiar temptations. That is no cause for abjuring our opportunities, only for withstanding the associated evils. Besides, is it not at least quite as probable that the sphere of politics would be refined and raised by the admission of women to its prerogatives, as that additional depravity would result? The average moral sensibility and conduct of women being higher than those of men, it would appear a baseless fear that the pouring of this purer current into public life would produce evil. Should women enter the realm of politics as selfish brawlers for personal notoriety and partisan victory, it would be their own shame, as it is the shame of men in a similar case. The cares, vexations, and hardships of domestic life likewise have their special temptations; and many poor wives and mothers are degraded and made odious by them. No one, however, would use this as an argument against marriage. The same reasoning applies to public life.

So far, then, as the considerations already noticed have any relevancy, the verdict must be rather in favor of than against the entrance of women into every sphere of life, as the full and equal companions of men. The next consideration is as to the probable effects of this course. It is a delicate and difficult topic to handle, but of an importance too extreme to be overlooked. The physical womanliness

of woman essentially consists in wifehood and maternity. This, of course, cannot be changed by any enlargement of her domain of interests and activities. Her moral womanliness consists in modesty and self-denial, the preponderance of disinterestedness over egotism. Now, is there any real likelihood that the assumption by women of the elective franchise, with its accompaniments, will destroy this type of womanhood, universally acknowledged as the ideal of womanly beauty and excellence? Is it not too well established in the authority of the most cultivated souls, to be so easily shaken? It is the true type which, developed out of the historic progress in social conditions, cannot be lost, but must be more confirmed and glorified by the continued action in the future of the same causes which have already produced it. Not the destruction of the most exalted moral type of feminine character, rather its extension to masculine character, is what is to be looked for in the changes of the future. The greater the number of types of character exhibited to the public, and the greater the facility of comparison between them, the more sharply defined, and the more clearly recognized, will the best one be. Will not a pure and noble woman, eminently fitted by her wisdom and virtues for social influence, entering the political arena, set an example there, adapted to make men revere her, assimilate to her, and become themselves more modest, self-sacrificing, and incorruptible? On the other hand, when she is unfitted and unworthy, will not the reflection in her, of their own vices of exasperated rivalry, pride, and tyranny, appear doubly detestable? Then the ideal, so far from being injured, would rather be improved, — manly responsibilities making the women less timid and foolish, contact with womanly sentiment making the men less coarse and reckless. How well this conclusion is sustained by sound probabilities, deserves to be carefully weighed.

In determining how far, if at all, women had best enter into the sphere of public life, and take part in the functions of government, there remains another consideration, which will be decisive with many minds. It is drawn from the differ-

ence between those things which are in themselves good, and therefore enduring parts of human life, and those things which are merely provisional means to good, — means necessitated by existing evils, but destined gradually to lessen, and finally to pass away. Were political government an intrinsic and permanent end, an essential good of humanity, all, or at least all who are qualified, should share in it; because every human being has a right to a portion in every thing which is indispensable to the completion of the human destiny. Liberty, culture, and work are intrinsic and eternal elements of the human lot: women, therefore, have as clear a claim to these as men. But government is not a good in itself, is not an end. It is an evil attendant on human wickedness, a means devised to prevent severer evils; an element of decreasing proportions, and of temporary duration. It is an artifice which we wish to see lessen, as fast as is safe, and to disappear as soon as is possible.

Take the example of war. War is an evil, a transient incident in the fortunes of humanity; therefore the fewer who take part in it the better. Women, being out of it, had best keep out of it. No one desires to have women become soldiers. Mental and physical labor will be a necessary part of the experience of humanity, as long as the world lasts; therefore men and women properly have a joint heritage in its exactions and its privileges. But government is a passing phase in the evolution of the social system: when men are perfected, it will vanish in spontaneous obedience. War or crude violence universally governed in the primitive society. Little by little, this barbaric reign of force was encroached upon and superseded by politics, the forms of statesmanship and legislation. Then, little by little, the realm and rule of politics began to shrink before the increasing sway of conscience, reason, and sympathy, the personal law of justice and love, the intrinsic motives and sanctions appropriated by the private heart from society and religion. As war has been narrowing and receding before politics, politics in turn must narrow and recede before morality. The less need a nation has of governmental interference for the securing of justice, the better off that



nation is. The smaller the number of persons engaged in working that political mechanism, which is never productive, but merely regulative, the better it would seem to be for the people. We do not desire ever to see a woman occupy the office of a hangman, nor of a prosecuting attorney, nor yet of an electioneering politician; because, these being transient accompaniments of an imperfect society, the desideratum is to have concentrated on them the interest and energy of the smallest number competent to secure the needful results of order. He who believes that a universal devotion to politics would most speedily achieve the end of politics, — namely, the supersedure of its whole machinery by the arrival at a self-rectifying observance of the conditions of private and public welfare, — must advocate the bestowment of legislative and other public functions on women. Let all take part in voting and governing, for the sake of more quickly reaching the time when none shall vote or govern, but every one be a law unto himself. On the contrary, he who believes — as in some aspects of the case seems more likely — that a universal rush into public life, forensic controversy, party and personal rivalry, would exasperate the interest, and diffuse and prolong the dominion, of politics, must earnestly recommend women to abstain from the noxious struggle. Whatever logical right they may have, he will think it best that they abandon that right, and devote their zeal to the sphere of morality, whose elements are the eternal concern of all humankind. A wider outbreak of plots and cabals, an enlargement of the chase for notoriety and the scramble for office, a more virulent division of neighbors and of families, a new lease for the spirit of ambition and partisanship, would be an evil of the deadliest fatality. Whoever holds that such an evil would date from the day of indiscriminate access to the ballot-box, and to every conspicuous place of authority, must beseech women to refrain from all overt share in politics, to study political questions disinterestedly in the light of moral science, and to exert their influence only through intelligence and sympathy, the argument and persuasion of character.

Manhood is differenced from womanhood by courage, hardi-

hood, muscular strength, pride, adventurousness, ambition, and self-assurance. These equipments for the contests of a public career tend to unwomanize a woman. Her genius is modesty, patience, reverence, submission, tender trust. Being out of politics, which is the transient sphere of some, is it not best that she keep out of it, and devote herself to morality, which is the permanent sphere of all? Here is furnished an honorable ground on which woman may be, not shut out of, but *excused from*, the province of government.

What is the ideal of perfect society? Is it a state where there is a universal contention for notice, power, and honor? Then let women enter that contest now. Is it a state where each is content with the personal fruition of his own powers, in harmony with the same enjoyment by all others? Then let women, by setting such an example of abstinence from the public realm of politics, draw men also to their true happiness, in the realm of home and morals. The latter must be the correct view, for this reason: only a few can be illustrious and govern; all can be good and obey; and the true ideal is that condition in which no government is needed, except the government of God. The eternal womanly quality is obedience: the temporary manly quality is authority. The world will be redeemed, only when the former has subdued and transformed the latter into its own likeness; when man and woman, no longer master and servant, but equals, press forward together, in free obedience to a common sovereignty.

Turning from the authority of history to the authority of moral science, there is no reason for the enslavement of woman to man. This is not yet fully seen, because the historic type of woman as pure subject, of man as pure sovereign, has sunk so deeply into the imagination of both sexes. The Gentoo Code declared, "A woman ought to burn herself alive on the funeral pyre of her husband." Body and soul, she was a mere appendage to him. The Mosaic Code declared woman unclean eighty days after bearing a female child, but only forty days after bearing a male child. The passage of thousands of years had brought a degree of physical emancipation to her; but she still remained mentally ser-

vile, when Katherine Parr said to her husband, Henry VIII., "Your majesty doth know right well, neither I myself am ignorant, what great imperfection and weakness, by our first creation, is allotted to us women, to be ordained and appointed as inferior and subject unto man as our head; and that, as God made man in his own likeness, even so hath he made woman of man, of whom and by whom she is to be governed, commanded, and directed." This type of unquestioning subjection and obedience is depicted by Chaucer, after Boccaccio, in his "Griselda," and by Tennyson in his "Enid." The husbands of these most lovely and womanly of women try their temper, their absolute subjectedness, by the most capricious, cruel, and wicked tests. They submit to every thing with un murmuring sweetness and fortitude, with infinite humility. The true lesson of these charming stories is, that an inexhaustible self-abnegation and obedience is the most heavenly trait and power of human nature. But it is a perversion to limit the application to woman. Moral excellence is the same in man as in woman. It is an outrage to make that meek submission to wrong, which shows so divinely in her, a duty. And it is equally an outrage to make that autocratic authority of man over woman, which he so complacently assumes, a right. The progressive emancipation of woman, revealed in history, will go on until she wholly ceases to be, in any sense, "a mere appendage of man," and they are mutually as independent as they are mutually dependent.

It is very curious to study the extremes of dishonor and of honor, in which women, as such, have been held, at different periods, under various social conditions. In the Oriental world, in consequence of the character fostered in them by despotism, — the triviality, ignorance, vanity, sensuality, jealousy, deceit, cunning, and fickleness, attending their mode of life, — they have always, on the whole, been regarded by men with complacent condescension as toys, or with distrust and scorn as dangerous and vicious inferiors. In the Classic world, they were always treated as far inferior to the other sex, and prevailingly held up in literature in the most odious

light, the marks of all sorts of contemptuous satire. Strong examples of this abound in the Greek and Latin poets. Euripides was surnamed the woman-hater, from the scorn with which he depicts the sex. The comedies of Aristophanes are mercilessly satirical and sarcastic, in their portrayals of women: his "*Ecclesiazusæ*" might be taken for a freshly painted ironical picture of the "Woman's-rights Movement" of to-day. In the Christian world, the pagan type of woman, thought of as lower and wickedder than man, bore for a long period an aggravated form, imparted by an intense theological dogma. The theologians, whose authority controlled the belief and sentiment of Christendom for many centuries, taught that woman — by the seduction of Adam and the introduction of original sin, which led to the crucifixion of Christ — was the guiltiest and worst of human beings, the Temptress of Man and the Murderess of God. Hear how Tertullian raged against her: "She should always be veiled, clothed in mourning, and in rags; that the eye may see in her a penitent, drowned in tears, and atoning for the sin of having ruined the human race. Woman, thou art the gateway of Satan."

In the world of modern civilization, the leading tendency, as betokened by the highest literary productions, is in the opposite direction from that of the Oriental, Classic, and early Christian worlds. It expresses reverence for woman as a moral superior; inclines to exalt her as angelic, almost as divine. There is error, there is confusion, in both these extremes. The element of sex has no value in determining the merit or demerit of a human being. Neither man nor woman is to be either blamed or praised for being male or female. A woman is no worse than a man, unless her moral qualities are lower; she is no better than he, unless her character is better. The chivalrous or poetic impulse to exalt woman, as such, relatively above man, is as mistaken as the impulse to degrade her beneath him. Humanity is worshipful only as it exhibits worshipful attributes; and these attributes have the same moral rank, whether they appear on the masculine or on the feminine side. A woman, consequently, does not deserve to be honored above a man, simply



because she is a woman, but only as she has more than he of the highest qualities of humanity; and she disclaims her divinest gift when she becomes an egotist, clamoring for supremacy. Humble abnegation is at once her own crown, and the spell with which she is to redeem man. The moment she demands precedence, that crown crumbles from her brows in fragments of dark decay.\*

The superiority increasingly ascribed to woman by fine minds in our era,—a trait conspicuous enough, when we look from Tibullus to Frauenlob, from Pindar to Patmore,—is often confusedly supposed to be her due, on account of some mysterious quality inherent in her mere femineity. It should be distinctly seen to be a simple consequence of the purer representation of goodness in her. This purer goodness is no matter of sex as such, but belongs to her by virtue of her personal renunciation of the struggle for precedence; her greater interior tenderness, modesty, spirit of sacrifice. Her mission, as the destined redemptress of society, is to set the example, and diffuse the spirit, of contented goodness,—goodness contenting itself with the universal growth of goodness. Now, in what other way can she ever fulfil this mission, except by attracting man likewise, through the influence of her example, to withdraw from the selfish battle for social distinction, and devote himself to the private attainment of personal perfection, and the public benefaction of his race? Therefore, that tendency of chivalry which led the troubadours and knights to install woman in the place of command, causing man to bow implicitly to her authority, is as erroneous as the state of things that preceded it. Neither is to command the other: both are to obey, and aid each other in obeying, what is intrinsically right and good. But

---

\* How finely this lesson is taught in the ancient Hindu epic, the "*Mahábhárata*." As Radhika walked with Krishna, her soul was elated with pride, and she thought herself better than he; and she said, "O my beloved! I am weary, and I pray you to carry me upon your shoulders." Krishna sat down and smiled, and beckoned to her to mount. But, when she stretched forth her hand, he vanished from her sight, and she remained alone, with outstretched hand. Then Radhika wept bitterly.

the chivalric transference of authority from man to woman is a striking instance of the propensity of human nature to oscillate from one extreme to the other before poising at the mean of truth,—a propensity which has so many curious illustrations in history.

Some of the champions of the "Rights of Women," in our day, apparently commit the error of inverting the real desideratum, which is, to make men renounce and love like the finest women,—not to make women exact and fight like the coarsest men. They act as if they thought men were both better and better off than women, and were to be taken as models by them: as if they supposed the redemption of women was to be secured by their becoming and doing, as nearly as possible, what men are and do. If there are any who really believe thus, they certainly invert the truth. No amount of voting, or of any other externality, will ever bring the millennium. It would be a poor delusion to fancy that the millennium will come when women shall be as fully engaged in the frenzied strife for riches, honor, station, power, fame, as men in general now are. It will come only when men shall be as renouncingly withdrawn from that contest, as women in general now are. Instead of wanting to make women ambitious rivals and gladiators, we want to make men modest students of goodness for its own sake; disinterested aspirants, seeking to fulfil their destiny by perfecting their faculties and acquirements, without any invidious comparisons. Our hope lies in woman the saint, not in woman the amazon. Woman, as seen in the Mary who sat at the feet of Christ, brings a heavenly ministration to rescue man from every thing impure or discordant: woman, as seen in the Penthesilea who fought Achilles, offers man but a perverted reflection of himself.

The common belief, that human life began in a paradisaal state, is a sentimental and mischievous error. The cradles of civilization are full of murder. First, for a period of unknown duration, raged the strife for precedence in physical power and its grossest symbols. In civilized nations, this strife is now reduced, for the most part, to boys and pugi-

lists, who are always eager to try each other's strength, and to crow above a thrown antagonist. Next came the strife for precedence in social power, and its finer symbols of rank, wealth, position, and fame. This strife may be traced in every record of the past and present; is far more extensive and seductive and tenacious than the former; and has been left behind, as yet, only by the saintliest exemplars of our race. The third period, the ideal period which we now await, is one in which there shall be no strife among mankind for comparative superiority over each other; but, in place of it, a universal co-operating struggle for intrinsic personal worth, a constant advancement in gaining the real prizes of being. Then the wretched experiences of hate, jealousy, exclusiveness, with their thousandfold sins and pains, will rapidly lessen, and soon end. There will be no motives for envy and opposition, since their aims will be alike; and the gain of each, so far from being a loss to the rest, will be a gain to all. Let there be no strife for precedence, and all society must be the wiser, purer, and happier for every spiritual gain made by any member of it.

Here lies the secret of genuine nobility and happiness for the individual, no less than of redemption for society. For those who quaff at the fountain of wisdom and virtue, find, as long as they live, the supply, the thirst, and the enjoyment,—all increasing in equal measure. There is neither satiety on the one side, nor exhaustion on the other. But the servants of factitious or external aims almost invariably get more disenchanted of the world, and more weary of life, with every year. Ambitious rivalry is wretchedness, and sure to end in sickening disappointment. Disinterested aspiration, equally to women and to men, is the benign mother of happiness.

We read in the Norse mythology, that the gods tied Loki, the impersonation of the evil principle, to three sharp rocks, and hung a snake over him in such a way, that its venom should drip on his face. But, in this dreadful case, there was one who did not forsake him. His wife Sigyn sate close by his head, and held a bowl to catch the torturing

drops. As often as the bowl was full, she emptied it with the utmost haste; because, during that time, the drops struck on his face, and made him writhe and howl with agony. Her patience in holding the bowl, and her speed in emptying it, never failed. It is a forcible emblem of the ministration of woman to man. But, for man to impose a service of this nature on woman as her duty, is a cruel arrogance and wrong. The voluntary spirit of such a service, the spirit of self-sacrificing devotion, teaches the one lesson which man himself needs to learn for his own salvation.

---

#### ART. VII. — JOSIAH QUINCY.

*Life of Josiah Quincy, of Massachusetts.* By his Son, EDMUND QUINCY. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1867.

OUR readers will share with us, we believe, the pleasure of obtaining at length a biography of the venerable man who was for so many years our American Nestor. Longevity among our public men is so rare, and our national history so short, that a peculiar interest belongs to the life of an eminent man, to whom great length of days has been granted; but particularly does it attach to one whose life spanned the whole compass of our national existence, in whose memory were stored up all its chief incidents, and who could truly say, what is so often quoted of inferior men, *quæque ipse vidi, et quorum pars magna fui*. His birth anticipated the Revolution. His earliest memory was united with one of its opening scenes, — the occupation of Boston by the British under Gage, and the flight of the chief patriots from the city. The vicissitudes and the final triumph of the struggle for Independence passed before his eyes. He had witnessed the failure of the Confederation, and the birth of the Union. He had enjoyed the privilege of a personal acquaintance with most of the fathers of our republic. He had been a guest at Governor Hancock's famous dinner-parties; had heard



from Hamilton's own lips his estimate of Burr; and had been received at the Presidential levees of Washington, whom, we must note as we pass, he found "a little stiff in his person, not a little formal in his manners," with the air of a country gentleman not accustomed to mix much in society, of whom Stuart's portrait is a highly idealized picture, and the best likeness is the picture by Savage, in Harvard Hall in Cambridge. He had commenced his Congressional career while Jefferson was President, and had been one of the most prominent actors in those early scenes of our feeble existence,—the admission of Louisiana, the Embargo, the War of 1812, and so on; on which the dust of history already lies pretty thick. And his years were protracted until the hopes of his country's prosperity, which the most fervid glow of his youthful anticipation could reach forward to, were more than realized; until the valor and the patriotism of the Revolution were exhibited again in a second, but incomparably vaster, struggle in the cause of freedom; until the ascendancy of slavery, which he had commenced his public life by opposing, at last received its death-wound; until he found himself in the midst of a third generation, venerated as the sole relic of the great men of the country's youth. Additional age brought only additional usefulness, honor, and enjoyment. To the end, he retained his bodily health sound, and his intellectual vision as strong and clear, as ever. It was with a serene and long-lingering light that the sun of his life slipped down its western arc, and, with a brightness still undimmed, that it at last dropped below the horizon. A life rounded with such dramatic completeness is of itself a unique phenomenon. Its unusual compass of three generations of breathing men, during nearly two of which he filled conspicuous public posts, makes it rich in materials of interest. The reader will find that there are few noted characters in our history, of whom there is not here some description, anecdote, or letter.

But besides the interest which comes from its associations, the life of Josiah Quincy deserves record and remembrance for what it was in itself. He was one of the very best of our public men;—to use the words of Motley in regard to

John Quincy Adams, whom Josiah Quincy in many respects strongly resembled, "among the small band of intellectual, accomplished, virtuous, and patriotic statesmen, not only of our country, but of all countries." His integrity was so conspicuous, that the breath of calumny never dared assail it. It used to be said of him, indeed, that he stood up so straight, that he leaned backwards. His adherence to what he deemed the right was inflexible, and the means he employed always straightforward and above-board. Dauntlessly courageous in all things, he never hesitated in the full expression of his convictions, or of his intense indignation at all acts of injustice or meanness. As an orator, he had the capital merits of clearness, purity, and directness of style, nervous energy, and warmth of feeling; but especially conspicuous was his frank boldness,—a quality which exposed him many times to general attack and unmerited calumny.\*

The time of Mr. Quincy's entrance into Congress was in the midst of the discussions upon the purchase and admission of Louisiana. Mr. Quincy at once took a prominent place; in the second session, becoming the leader of the Federalist party. He sagaciously discerned the real intent and bearing of the purchase and admission of Louisiana and the other South-western States, and too truly prophesied the result,—the unsettling of the equilibrium of the Union, the gradual diminution of the weight of the Northern commercial States,

---

\* A memorable instance is the declaration, in his speech upon the admission of Louisiana, "that, if this bill passes, the bonds of this Union are virtually dissolved; that the States which compose it are free from their moral obligations; and that, as it will be the right of all, so it will be the duty of some, to prepare definitely for a separation, amicably if they can, violently if they must,"—which at the time created such excitement, and has been made the ground for the assertion, that the first announcement of the doctrine of secession on the floor of Congress was made by a Northern man. The charge, however, is not well founded. The doctrine of modern secession is the constitutional right of peaceable secession, whenever any State thinks itself in any way aggrieved. Mr. Quincy's declaration, as will be seen by a little attention to the passage, especially in connection with the rest of the speech, was an assertion of the dissolution of the *moral* obligation of a State or a section of the country to the authority of the Union, in case of a flagrant violation of the Constitution or of the rights of such State or section, and the consequent right of revolution. The difference between the two doctrines needs only to be stated.

and the securing of political ascendancy to the Southern, by means of the manufacture of new slave States in the Southwest, out of territory not originally included in the territory of the Union, nor in the purview of those who formed the Union. Mr. Quincy was one of the very first to discern the insidious nature of slavery in our institutions, its disastrous influence upon the prosperity of the North, and its inevitable tendency to grow and strengthen itself, unless speedily and effectually checked; and it was this feeling that pervaded and gave unity to his Congressional action. He warned the people that their distresses would not be removed by relief from embargo or war; that the jugglers would then only shift their hands; that those distresses would be renewed in fresh forms, as long as the three-fifths slave ratio, and the unlimited power of carving new slave States out of territory acquired for this purpose, permitted the control of the government to remain in the hands of the slave-power. Each additional encroachment of slavery, the annexation of Texas, the war with Mexico and the appropriation of its northern territory, the Compromises of 1850, the Nebraska Bill, and so on, came upon him not unexpectedly, but as the inevitable consequences of the slaveholding supremacy gained by Jefferson's *coup d'état* of 1803.

His son may justly, we think, claim that "perhaps no man did more than he to impress upon the general mind of New England the real source of the calamity of her people, and to implant the germ of that moral, religious, and political hostility to slavery, which afterwards grew to such prevailing strength." We say this, not forgetful of the early and great labors of such men as Mr. Garrison and Mr. Phillips. Josiah Quincy, we perhaps need to remind our readers, was an anti-slavery man a score of years before Garrison printed the first sheet of the "Liberator;" and his clear warnings and appeals antedate the earliest of Mr. Phillips', by a quarter of a century. His devotion to the cause was maintained through his whole life. The fire was not allowed to grow cold with the frosts of old age or the considerations of political expediency or personal interest, which availed with so many Northern statesmen. It burned

as bright at ninety as at forty. In the first organized effort of the North to check the career of slavery, — the election of 1856, — he joined personally in the canvass in behalf of Colonel Fremont, although already eighty-four years old. The outbreak of the late civil war did not deject him; but in the rising of the North, which accompanied it, he recognized the most hopeful sign of the future of his country. "Now I know," he said, "we are going to be a great nation. I never felt sure of it before." His very last public address was given in the common cause of human freedom and the preservation of the Union. The aspiration of his patriot father, — a martyr of the Revolution, although he did not find his death on the field of battle, — that the spirit of liberty might rest upon his son, did not fail of an ample fulfilment.

The other issues of Mr. Quincy's Congressional life, exciting as they were at the time, have not had much lasting influence upon the course of our national history, and have fallen into a good deal of obscurity. It is sufficient to say, that Mr. Quincy distinguished himself in almost all of them, and exhibited the same boldness, sound sense, and political foresight. In his next field of public service, as mayor of the newly organized city government of Boston, he did equally excellent service. Boston owes to him the introduction of many of its model municipal institutions, such as the House of Industry, the House of Reformation for Juvenile Offenders (which excited the particular admiration of De Tocqueville when in this country), the organization of a police force, and a fire department with effective fire-engines; and, last but not least, the Quincy Market. The government of cities was at that time a new experiment in America; and the improvements which Mr. Quincy effected during his mayoralty were not only of great and permanent benefit to his native city, but had a widely extended usefulness in the assistance which they gave to municipal organization throughout the country.

His administration, however, was too inflexible and too thorough, the changes he made too many and too radical, not to make him many bitter enemies; and, after five re-elections,



his official life came to an end in 1828. But his energy, industry, and practical business talent, were at once called into requisition for another important work of executive reform; viz., to extricate from its embarrassments, and set on its feet, the ancient University of Cambridge. To this work he gave sixteen years of unremitting and unwearied work; and as President Walker, his third successor, has said, "When we call to mind the state of things at the time of his appointment, it seems to me that he will be for ever remembered as *the great organizer of the University.*" In view of the present demand for a broader and freer system of college education, it is noteworthy that the elective or proper university system was strenuously urged by Mr. Quincy, and was carried out to a greater extent under his administration than it has ever been since.

At seventy-four, although his natural force was still unabated and his faculties in the highest condition, he thought it wise to retire betimes from the duties of public office. But it was not to repose upon his laurels: it was only to change the field of his unintermitting industry. A municipal History of Boston, a Memoir of Samuel Shaw, a History of the Boston Athenæum, a Memoir of John Quincy Adams,—works of laborious research, whose accuracy, candor, and vigorous style have secured them honorable places in their department of literature; the care of a large farm, and many extensive and valuable experiments in agriculture and live-stock; the acquisition, after his eightieth year, of a fortune of several hundred thousand dollars in an enterprise which he had vainly begged the city government to undertake,—these were some of the ways in which the retirement and the evening of his life was passed. It was, however, to this constant mental activity, without doubt, together with his temperate and regular habits, and attention to the care and exercise of his body, that he was indebted for his exemption from the infirmities of old age. He himself, at least, so regarded it, and maintained it from principle. His continual shifting to new fields of work, was, doubtless, also highly beneficial. Such change of the field of work is rather more

common than uncommon with us. No American of talent is satisfied until he has tried two or three vocations, and an equal number of different public posts. If he has filled one with merit, he thinks that he is, and is commonly thought to be, fitted for every other. Nevertheless, there are not many who have engaged in so many different fields as Mr. Quincy did; and there are still fewer with whom success in one field has not been countervailed by failure in another. With Mr. Quincy, new fields of service only brought new successes. The dramatic completeness of his life extended also here.

This feature of completeness, indeed, should be especially noticed as a distinguishing characteristic of Mr. Quincy,—as, in fact, the trait which individualizes him. We have seen how felicitously his life exhibited it. It was found equally in his character. Bred in the stormy days of the Revolution, of the purest Puritan ancestry, he had the sturdy qualities—the manly strength of will and intellect, the massiveness and purity of character—which befitted his origin. But these stern qualities were tempered in him by the culture of the scholar, the graces of the polished gentleman, lively sympathies, a cheery good-humor, and a playful wit. Intense in his hatreds, and vehement in his denunciations, their objects were never so much men, as principles and acts. Conscientiously faithful in the discharge of the smallest duties, personally supervising the minutest details, emphatically a practical man, he had, notwithstanding, the bold and comprehensive views which are commonly supposed to belong only to the theorist. Born in the lap of fortune, throughout his life placed above the necessity of toil, his vigor was not emasculated, his life was not suffered to be one of idleness, but was made one of severe and incessant industry, prolonged almost to the day of his death. When the snows of age had covered his head, he still maintained the fresh feelings of youth and its hearty zest of life. Though with reason proud of the past in which he had lived, he sympathized keenly in all the great events and questions of the day, and recognized a continual progress in the movement of the world. The aristocratic influence of a descent from one of the oldest and

highest families of the country; the conservative tendencies of old age, large fortune, and long-continued prosperity, — never chilled the ardor of his early love of liberty, of his faith in American principles, his sympathies with the oppressed, his enthusiasm in all measures of social improvement, or of his hopes for the future. Clear and settled in his own religious and theological beliefs, he would not melt, "in an acid sect, the Christian pearl of charity." Though for many years standing on the very verge of the grave, he maintained to the last a serene cheerfulness, and met his end, as he had always looked forward to it, without fear and without eagerness.

A rounded completeness of life like that of Josiah Quincy, is a rare felicity among the gifts of fortune. Of equal rarity, at least, is just poise and proportioned symmetry of character. But the conjunction of the two is such as we find in him at once noble and unique. Without such completeness, to be sure, no life can satisfy a sensitive and reflecting mind. It is the ideal which is the aim of all. It is the fulfilment of our duty, to make full use of all our talents. It is the measure enjoined for all to fill out. But it is still among the rarest of sights; and in pointing it out as marking the life and character of Josiah Quincy, we accord the highest praise.

The subject of the biography has had such attractions, that we have not yet spoken of the merits or defects of the biography itself. It has both. It has the paternal merit of a lucid, straightforward, clear-cut, manly style. It has the merit of clear division and convenient arrangement, especially of not having forgotten that most important part of a biographical memoir, — an alphabetical index of topics and persons. Its tone is much more moderate and restrained than is usually found in lives written by near relatives. On the other hand, the treatment of the different divisions of the subject is very unduly proportioned. In particular, we must complain of the excessive share of attention given to the Congressional life of Mr. Quincy. Almost half the whole book is surely more than the eight years he passed in Congress, in the distant and much-forgotten period of Jefferson's and Madison's

administrations, deserve. Many long-buried controversies and quarrels have been given too much notice; and the extracts from Mr. Quincy's speeches and addresses, considering that they are already in print and not difficult of access, seem to us somewhat unnecessarily copious. By such retrenchments, room would have been made for more extracts from his interesting private diary, for the pleasing Memoir of Mrs. Quincy, which has hitherto been allowed only a private circulation, and for more of the personal details, incidents, and anecdotes, the command of which, for the illustration of his subject, is the great advantage a son has in writing the biography of his father.

---

ART. VIII. — REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

## 7

## THEOLOGY.

THE literature of Spinozism has received important additions within the last few years. The publication at Amsterdam, in 1862, of the supplementary volume of Spinoza's works,\* awakened a new interest in his philosophy. The most valuable part of this work is the first draught which it contains — an outline sketch, as it were — of the "Ethica." In this we trace the genesis of that remarkable moral geometry, in which ethical truth was afterwards unfolded in all the rigid sequence of axioms and propositions, corollaries and scholia. The same year in which this supplementary volume appeared, was published at Göttingen an interesting work, by Van der Linde,† giving an account of a sect of Christians that arose in Holland, towards the end of the seventeenth century, who united Spinozism with the doctrines of the Reformed religion. The very existence of this sect of Spinozists seems to have been almost forgotten in more recent times; but its influence upon theology in Holland, during the period in which it flourished, cannot have been inconsiderable. Whether we call it a genuine branch of Spinozism, — an application

---

\* *Ad Benedicti de Spinoza Opera quæ supersunt omnia Supplementum.* Amsterdam: Fréd. Müller, 1862.

† *Spinoza: Seine Lehre und deren erste Nachwirkungen in Holland.* Von VAN DER LINDE. Göttingen, 1862.



of Spinoza's philosophy to theology, like the present Hegelian Christianity in Germany; or whether, as M. Janet conjectures, it was simply one of the numberless products of the Protestant theology, which borrowed certain formulas and modes of expression from the works of Spinoza then in vogue,—from either point of view, its history is an important chapter in the development of doctrine, and perhaps explains, in the words of Janet, “how the Spinozistic idea, apparently lifeless and smothered during a whole century, was revived with such splendor in Germany at the beginning of the present century.”

The treatise on “Modern Pantheism,” by M. Emile Saisset, the able French translator of Spinoza, has been rendered into English, and is too well known to need further notice. A more recent work relating to the philosophy of Spinoza is that of M. Nourisson,† which M. Janet has reviewed, at considerable length and with great ability, in a late number of the “Revue des Deux Mondes.” Both M. Nourisson and M. Janet belong to the French spiritualistic school, and are among the most earnest opponents of that philosophy, now so rife in France, which M. Nourisson calls *le naturalisme contemporain*. The point in dispute between these eminent critics is the affinity of Spinozism with this so-called naturalism. M. Nourisson, following Voltaire, and agreeing with Van Vloten, the Dutch editor of Spinoza's supplementary volume (who boasts that Spinoza got rid of God as if this were the chief glory of his philosophy), reduces Spinozism to a kind of atheistic materialism. Spinoza, he thinks, was in perfect accord with those philosophers of the present day who admit no other reality than Nature, *i.e.*, the material universe. M. Janet, on the other hand, while admitting that this view of Spinozism prevailed during the last century, affirms that Germany, speaking through such voices as Lessing, Schleiermacher, and Schelling, has presented Spinoza's philosophy in a nobler aspect. He agrees with Saisset in maintaining, that Pantheism in general, and Spinozism in particular, is profoundly distinct from atheism. The argument of M. Janet on this point is so clearly stated, that we give a translation of certain parts of his article in the “Revue des Deux Mondes.”

According to Van Vloten, Spinoza, in retaining the name of God, while denying the divine reality, has given superficial readers a false impression of his philosophy. “This,” says Janet, “is to do little

---

† Spinoza et le Naturalisme Contemporain. Par M. NOURISSON. Paris, 1866.

honor to a philosopher whom one glories in, since it charges him with a want either of sincerity or of discrimination: of sincerity, if he knowingly called that God which for him was only Nature; of discrimination, if he could not see that his God was nothing but Nature." Of course, M. Janet admits neither hypothesis. The sincerity of Spinoza has never been called in question; while he is acknowledged to have been too profound a thinker to have been an atheist without knowing it. But Spinoza is said, both by materialists and spiritualists, to have denied God because he denied the divine personality. "Is personality, then," asks Janet, "the first attribute of God? Is that the essence, the definition of the Divine Being? By no means. Not a single philosopher of the last century, even among Catholic theologians, defined God by personality. All, without exception, — Bossuet, Fénelon, Descartes, Malebranche, — defined God as 'the Being infinitely perfect,' 'Being without limitation,' 'Being with nothing added.' Now, that is the definition which Spinoza has given. According to him, 'God is infinite Substance, consisting of an infinite number of attributes infinitely infinite.' Like Descartes, he regards being, reality, perfection, as one and the same thing. The infinite Being, then, is the infinite perfection. The principle of things is not with Spinoza, as with Hegel, the least possible being, — a *quasi* nothingness; nor is it, as with the post-Hegelians, Matter with its physical and chemical properties: it is Being in its fulness, in its eternal and absolute essence. All perfection, all good, flows from substance as its source; and it will not be straining language to say, that with Spinoza, as with Plato, God is the Good *in itself*, — the *Idea of the Good*.

"Undoubtedly, the manner in which Spinoza understands this absolute perfection may be called in question. We may say, that personality, consciousness, and free-will are the necessary attributes of a truly perfect Deity. Granted; but that is matter for subsequent discussion. When Descartes speaks of the perfect being, he does not say what constitutes that perfection. St. Anselm, in defining God as the greatest being we can conceive, — *quo non majus concipi potest*, — does not tell us wherein that greatness consists. The essence of Deity, considered in itself, is quite another thing from the various attributes by which we endeavor to define that essence. When Fénelon says that even the expression *l'Esprit* is inapplicable to God, and that we ought to say of him only that he is Being with nothing added, he says neither more nor less than Spinoza. I add,

finally, that, even in the Christian Trinity, the Father, considered in himself, is nothing but Substance, — the ineffable and indefinable Source of all life and all perfection.”

Spinoza, as is well known, distinguished among the divine attributes only Extension and Thought. “But,” says Janet, “that which Spinoza attributes to Deity is extension in its idea, without limitation and without qualification. It is a purely ideal, absolute extension, which he makes an attribute of the Perfect Substance.” We need not follow M. Janet in the argument whereby he shows that Spinozism, in its doctrine both of Extension and of Thought, is widely separated from the views of our modern Materialism. Indeed, it needs but a slight acquaintance with Spinoza’s “*Ethica*,” to convince one that his Deity is not a World-Divinity, but a Soul-Divinity. The world is not all, but in itself is as nothing. The All is Spirit, — that absolute, self-subsisting Essence which finite intelligences know but in part, as it is manifested in the two attributes of Extension and Thought. This Divine Essence is the one great reality; and Nature, *i.e.*, the material universe, so far from constituting that essence, is real only as it shares therein.

But we return to M. Janet, whose further reply to M. Nourisson deserves attention: —

“Let us not forget,” he says, “that Spinoza not only admits the existence of God, but also distinguishes him from the world; without, indeed, separating him therefrom, but also without confounding them together. What but this is the meaning of that capital distinction in his philosophy, between *natura naturans* and *natura naturata*? and why should he not have said there is but *one* nature, if he had meant so? The *natura naturans* is the world of the Absolute, the Indivisible, the Immovable, the Intelligible. This world is not blended with the other: it subsists in itself in its eternal serenity, manifested and expressed by the phenomenal world, but abiding infinitely above it. . . .

“I am far from maintaining, that the Spinozistic distinction between God and the world is sufficient; but, after all, what metaphysician, having separated God from the world, in trying to re-unite them (for that is the point he must come to), has always shown a perfect logic and a real perspicuity? Metaphysicians in general touch only one side of things, and are silent about that which perplexes them. Separate God too widely from the world, and you fall into the ancient Dualism; unite them too closely, and you run the risk of falling into Pantheism. There must be a middle ground; but where is it? Who has fixed it? It is the same as in politics. Nothing is easier than to separate powers: the real problem is to unite them and make them

agree. Between anarchy and despotism there must be a mean; and that mean is as difficult to find as any in metaphysics."

Another point of difference between Spinozism and contemporary Naturalism, M. Janet finds in their different theories of the origin of ideas :—

"According to Naturalism, every thing is derived from experience: according to Spinoza, all is dependent on reason. On one side, every thing is explained by reducing facts the most elevated to those which are the lowest; descending from thought to sensation, from sensation to organization, from organization to the combinations of brute matter. In a word, Naturalism tends to trace every thing back to physico-chemical combinations, and these again to mechanical laws. Spinoza sees in mechanism only a form of the universal activity: there is another form absolutely different, — *thought*; and still others *ad infinitum*, since God possesses an infinity of attributes of which we are ignorant. According to Naturalism, the Good consists in pleasure and in the means wisely fitted to avoid pain. With Spinoza, the Sovereign Good consists in the knowledge and love of the Infinite Perfection. Finally, according to Naturalism, the soul perishes with the body. According to Spinoza, on the contrary, 'we perceive, we feel, that we are immortal.'"

We have given only the most prominent points in the article of M. Janet. Enough, however, has been cited to disprove the claim of M. Nourisson, that Spinozism is identical in its main positions with the philosophical materialism of the present day. A double motive, M. Janet tells us in conclusion, has induced him to insist upon the difference upon Spinoza's philosophy and contemporary Naturalism :—

"Our first reason," he says, "is, that the history of philosophy ceases to exist, when, by violent reductions and unreasonable interpretations, all doctrines, however remote from each other they may be, are assimilated on the ground of their having certain analogies."

The other reason has to do, not with the history of philosophy, but with philosophy itself. In behalf of all true philosophy, M. Janet protests against that logical process, so much in vogue at the present day, whereby one doctrine is reduced to another by simply drawing out all the consequences which it is supposed to involve. Applied to religious philosophy, this process leaves us only the sad alternative of bald Atheism, or the Catholicism of the Encyclical. The logical steps which lead to these opposite goals are thus described by M. Janet :—



"On one side, certain philosophers, abandoning a spiritual philosophy which seems to them only an arbitrary collection of heterogeneous doctrines, deny, by reason of logic, that the Infinite, the Absolute, can have personality, consciousness, and free-will; and, in order to escape what they call anthropomorphism, rush themselves, and wish to drag us with them, into a kind of pantheistic idealism. Once there, they are in turn seized and hurried away by other logicians, who demand of them the meaning of these vague entities, — Substance, the Infinite, the Absolute, Idea, Spirit; whether any thing is known in Nature but matter and its elementary and constituent forces; and whether matter and force do not suffice to explain every thing. Those who are of this school reject all transcendental, metaphysical being, whether personal or not; they explain every thing in Nature by the blind forces of matter, and in man by the not less blind forces of organization. The ethics of this philosophy cannot be stated so clearly; but the same logical process which conducts us from Plato to Plotinus, from Plotinus to Spinoza, and from Spinoza to Epicurus, would probably lead to like results in morals, and give us in time the ethics of Hobbes and Helvetius.

"While philosophy thus descends again from the cloudy heights, where it was seen at the beginning of the century, into the lowest abysses of atheistic materialism, Theology, by a movement the reverse of this, leads us, little by little, to Joseph de Maistre and the Middle Age. And this retrograde movement also proceeded at first, though unconsciously, from the same spiritual philosophy. This philosophy, no longer content with being spiritual, *wished to be Christian*, — not, indeed, in the dogmatic and theological sense, not by the sacrifice of reason, but with an evident favoritism for the thinkers of Christendom, those who have labored to unite philosophy with Christianity, — St. Augustine, St. Thomas, Malebranche, Bossuet. Such is the first step, undoubtedly very legitimate, very wise, not pledging us to go farther; but, nevertheless, it is the first step whereby spiritualistic rationalism is carried beyond its fundamental position, and tempted to rest on a support which it had previously regarded as unnecessary. Once on this declivity, new logicians carry us still farther. . . .

"We are told, that, if we admit the personality of God, his freedom, we must not content ourselves with a general and vague Providence, working by universal laws: we must concede the immediate, special intervention of God in nature; that, since these laws are contingent and God is free, the suspension of such laws involves no contradiction. Finally, we are shut up in the dilemma, 'Believe in miracles, or be atheists.' Well, suppose we admit the first part of the dilemma, we are not yet at the end. In Christianity, we are told, we may confine ourselves to the essential, to fundamental dogmas: but Catholic logic has long since done justice to that arbitrary distinction between fundamental and accessory dogmas; and, besides, suppose such a distinction made, what shall be the partition line? Who shall decide what dogmas are essential, and what are not? And even in regard to essential dogmas, who shall interpret them? Who shall fix the point of faith? Who shall decide the

dispute between Arius and Athanasius? There must be a criterion; *and, if any one thing is demonstrated by logic, it is that Protestantism has none.* Let us escape, then, to individual liberty; that is to say, to Fancy: or let us take the principle of Authority; behold us in Catholicism!

“Happy, then, the minds, bold and blind, who stand at the extremes of the intellectual and moral world, and are not afraid to say, with equal assurance, — these, that matter, with its brute forces, is the principle of every thing; those, that all liberty is folly, and that there is somewhere on earth an infallible Sovereign before whom every creature must bow. Unhappy the clear spirits, unwilling to be dispossessed of the right of thinking for themselves, who have not ceased to believe that the moral world has a guide and a judge. Between Atheism and the servitude of conscience and thought the alternative is not pleasant. Nevertheless to this alternative are we brought by the excesses of that logical process which is the disease of our times.”

H. G. S.

SIMULTANEOUS with the numerous carefully prepared essays in English which Professor Evans's translation of Stahr's "Life of Lessing" has brought out, comes the French "Study" of Fontanès,\* which, in suggestiveness and finish, is equal to any of them. The French writer confines himself to the theological labors of the prophet of reform, and measures the way and the extent of the heresy of the pioneer of liberal faith in Germany. By skilful quotation from the writings of Lessing, the polemic tracts against Goetze, "Nathan the Wise," and the "Education of the Human Race," he manages to set forth the ideas of the rationalist of the eighteenth century, on most of the questions which interest inquirers in this nineteenth century; he gives in short compass, but very clearly, Lessing's view of the Bible, of Revelation, of the essence of Christianity, and of the functions of the Church and priesthood. He vindicates Lessing most successfully from the charge of teaching Pantheism or materialism, and shows how widely he differed from Spinoza and Voltaire. The Lessing of this volume is not a scoffing sceptic or a vague dreamer, but a wise, enlightened, and reverent thinker; a purifier, but not a destroyer; a liberal, but yet a sincere Christian. He is rather the successor of Pascal than of Reimarus; and he has no scorn even for the legends which he rejects.

"Faithful to the apologetic style of the seventeenth century, which demonstrates the truth of Christianity by the miracles, the prophecies, and the resur-

---

\* *Le Christianisme Moderne, Étude sur Lessing.* Par ERNEST FONTANÈS. Paris: Baillière, 1867. 18mo. pp. viii, 214.

rection, Reimarus was led to conclude that Christianity is the fruit of an imposture, of which he has proved that the grounds on which its defenders rely will not bear examination. This conclusion is inevitable for a man of the eighteenth century; but here is one of the points on which Lessing does not belong to his age. He will not shut himself up along with orthodoxy in this ruined citadel, to be buried along with Christianity under the ruins of these superannuated arguments. He founds his demonstration of Christianity on the 'inner witness,' which is not a fact of ancient story, but is constantly reproduced in the soul of every one to whom the Christian religion is brought. He created a new apologetic style, of which Pascal had already drawn the outlines. The Fragmentist, under the blows of his criticism, prostrates Christianity, with all its proofs from tradition. Lessing always proved his right to be counted among the defenders of Christianity. He sacrificed the outposts only to save the fortress."

No nobler words have ever been written in polemic discussions than those which Lessing wrote about the Bible and practical religion. He recognized the influence of Christianity as purest and best where there was least of the theological spirit. "I wish to separate," he says, "religion from the history of religion. I refuse to think that the historical knowledge of the birth and development of the Christian religion is an indispensable thing. I declare that all objections which can be brought against the historical part of the religion are of small moment, whether they can be refuted or not. I am not willing to admit, that the weak sides of the Bible are the weak sides of the religion. I have no patience with the boastings of the theologian, who assures the simple believer that all these objections have been long ago refuted. And I despise this short-sighted hermeneutics, which piles one possibility upon another, to maintain that it is possible that those weak points are not perhaps weak points, which cannot stop one breach that the enemy has made, without going on to make another larger still."

There is a wonderful fascination in the works of this great writer. The honest, noble nature of the man shines through all his thoughts. In our judgment, the finest statement of gospel liberality and charity, in all modern literature, is found in Lessing's drama of "Nathan the Wise."

C. H. B.

WHETHER Positivism "prays and is religious," as has been denied of Theism, we have no means of knowing. That it can preach very excellent and instructive sermons, must be owned by any one who has had the good fortune to read a volume of admirable dis-

courses\* by the Rev. James Cranbrook, of Edinburgh, — a book which some American firm would do well to republish. Mr. Cranbrook is no believer in the view of Professor Shedd, that “a masculine and vigorous *rhetoric* is the great want of the Church.” Rhetorical log-rolling and metaphysical hair-splitting are equally foreign to the purpose of this sturdy Scot, who is satisfied, and, what is better, satisfies his readers, with setting forth the truth he has to tell in a plain and intelligible manner. The key-note of the volume before us is given in a single sentence of the Preface; viz., that “it is possible to found our religious beliefs upon the living facts of our own daily experience.” That such a principle, applied to the topics commonly treated in the pulpit, should lead sometimes to conclusions widely at variance with traditional theology, is not surprising, especially when we consider how seldom such theology is in accordance with those conceptions of truth which our best thinking and the surest results of science and criticism enable us to form. Yet Mr. Cranbrook would be fully justified in claiming for himself the Christian name. The facts of religious experience, from which he reasons, are not hostile to Christian faith; while the actual influence in the world of the person and character of Christ is fully recognized as a fact of profoundest significance.

In the opening discourse, entitled “Where God is found,” Mr. Cranbrook says, “This, therefore, is my message of grace to those crying out for the living God, ‘Go and contemplate Christ, as depicted in the Gospels. It will awaken, not by your effort, but by the touch of God’s hand, your devout feelings; you will in the feeling find the presence of your God.’” And again, in the sermon on “Love to the Unseen Christ,” “Let what will come in the future, let criticism do what it will to the sacred history and literature, it can never deprive us of this wonderful ideal. It is stamped on every page of the Church’s history; it is interwoven with all the Church’s devotions; it has formed the thoughts of men down to the present day. It must, therefore, irrespective of outward circumstances, enter into our thoughts and mould our conceptions of the divine in humanity. . . . And thus, whether Colani and Strauss be victorious or defeated, still will every great and noble and holy soul be able to declare of Christ, ‘Whom having not seen, we love.’”

---

\* *Credibilia*; or, Discourses on Christian Faith. By the Rev. JAMES CRANBROOK, Edinburgh. London and Edinburgh: A. Fullarton & Co.



In the sermon entitled "What is Sin?" utilitarian morals are very plainly inculcated. Yet, looking only at what is practical, we can find little fault with Mr. Cranbrook's *application* of this ethical doctrine. The aim of all preaching should be to awaken the divine life in the soul. If a philosophy allied with Positivism can make God's presence felt,—create a healthful sense of the sinfulness there is in all transgression of the divine laws, and teach the sacred meanings of our common, every-day pursuits of business and study, of work and play, let us gladly accept the fruit of such preaching, and cease our foolish complaints about the shape of the tree. Positivism may be a poor philosophy wherewith to explain religion; but, whenever any believer in this philosophy sets forth the facts of religious experience with the clearness and force which characterize Mr. Cranbrook's "Credibilia," we shall bid him God-speed. The "Church of the Future," so often projected, so slow in building, will be a mighty cathedral, in whose construction many builders of many generations and of many beliefs shall labor. If we cannot agree with those who think that Positivism will be its *Michael Angelo*, we are yet willing to let the work go on as the Great Architect shall order, confident that he will accept every offering which is made "in spirit and in truth."

H. G. S.

#### HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

THIS book\* has a certain interest in connection with the article which we publish this month, condensing the result of Bunsen's inquiry as to Egypt's place in history. Its main theory is, that the great pyramid at Ghizeh was built as a standard of mensuration, which standard was determined for the ancients by the diameter and circumference of the globe, the secret of its spherical shape having been already discovered. The azimuth of the entrance-passage coincides with the astronomical meridian of the place; and, that the standard of dry-measure might never be lost, the porphyry coffer of Cheops was built in to the sealed structure. Mr. Taylor proceeds to his statements, without the least regard to the inscriptions already deciphered in the pyramids themselves, and apparently ignorant that a building, erected in conformity to the ritual of an astral faith, would of necessity *preserve* such measures, whether erected for the purpose or not! What-

---

\* The Great Pyramid: Why was it Built? By JOHN TAYLOR. London Longman, Green, & Longman, 1859; 2d edition, 1864.

ever we may think of the theory, the book is full of original suggestion, which the favorable mention of Herschel and Piazzi Smith forbid the scholar to ignore. We proceed to extract the pith from his pages.

The early world bore traces of an antediluvian measure, in a certain sacred or double cubit, — the cubit of Karnak, estimated by Gardner Wilkinson, — and which Taylor finds to be the basis of every sort of mensuration in the great pyramid. A proof of the existence of the double cubit is preserved in Herodotus. The priests told him, that, in the reign of Moeris, the Nile overflowed all the land when it rose to the height of eight cubits; but, in the time of Herodotus, it had to rise to the height of *sixteen* cubits to overflow the same land. Eight cubits of Karnak, in use fifteen hundred years before Christ, were equal to sixteen cubits in use a thousand years later. Scripture is quoted (2 Chron. iii. 3) to show the use among the Hebrews of a double measure. The height of Solomon's temple, in 2 Chron. called a hundred and twenty, is represented in 1 Kings as equal to thirty cubits of the *first* measure. The fourth of the cubit of Karnak was a *span*. Taylor believes this cubic-measure, derived from the earth's belt, to have had a relation to the mensuration of time. "There was signified on the pyramid," says Herodotus, "by means of *Egyptian characters*, "how much was expended on radishes, onions, and garlic for the laborers; and, as I well remember, the interpreter, reading over, said it amounted to sixteen hundred talents of silver." Egyptian characters were generally pictorial, and he believes the inscription to have been a measure of the earth's radius or diameter, indicated by the signs still in use, — as degrees (°), minutes (′), and seconds (″); these, cut in the stone, being not unlike vegetables. "The second of the diameter," he says, "is *sixteen inches*, of which measure there are three hundred and sixty in the 5,760 inches at present called a second."

"When the new earth was first measured after the Deluge [or Edenic convulsions, as Bunsen would say], it was found that it exceeded the diameter of the old earth by a distance equal to 36.868 miles." This change produced a change in all measures.

The porphyry coffer, or "tomb of Cheops," — the pyramid having been built to preserve the sacred antediluvian measure, — is then considered. The coffer stands in the chamber, in the meridian, north and south, but only half the distance from the east wall that it is from the west. In this coffer we find the old measure of the chaldron (Latin, *caldarium*, or hot-bath), not used by us as a liquid measure, but naturally enough taking that name if measures were shaped like

this coffer or the Hebrew laver, both precisely like a bath. He then shows the extraordinary coincidence of English measures with those of the coffer. Its contents are equal to 4 quarters of wheat = 128 pecks = 32 bushels = 4 Hebrew chomers = 128 Greek hecters = 128 Roman modii. Now a pint is equal to a pound; so, if our original chaldron were shaped like a trough (trö), from that would come Troy weight, or "trough weight," for solids.\*

There is no doubt, we suppose, that wheat originally determined all measures; but 8 lbs. of wheat Troy was equal in bulk to 10 lbs. of water, Troy weight. So any vessel that would hold 10 lbs. of water, only held 8 lbs. of corn. Before the phrase "Avoirdupois" came into use, the water-measure was expressed by the phrase "merchants' pound." All profits of sales were made by buying pounds of 16 ounces, to sell pounds of 12. The bakers' dozen of 13, sold out at 12, had a similar antiquity. The same base — i.e., the cubit of Karnak — controlled the pyramid, Solomon's temple, the coffer of Cheops, and the chaldron of Henry III. The proportion of the diameter of a circle to its circumference is now represented by 1 to 3.1415927. When the pyramid was built, it was as 1 to 3.141792. This measure allows to the diameter 500 millions of inches, but these were *English inches*!

To the measures before the Flood, we owe the sacred cubit attributed to the Ark, — the Karnak cubit of the pyramid, and the primitive English mile of 5,760 feet, an eleventh part greater than the present mile. The coffer contains 256 gallons of water, each gallon weighing 10 lbs. merchants', or Avoirdupois, weight; also 256 gallons of wheat, each gallon weighing 10 lbs. Troy.

In England, by law, 32 grains of middle-sized wheat are equal to 24 grains Troy. He shows, in this connection, the origin of the English word *mud*, in the Mut or *Mwt* of the San-Chun-Iath.

In commenting with interest on this book, Sir John Herschel says, "Mr. Taylor has the merit of pointing out, that the *same slope* belongs to any pyramid which has each of its faces superficially equal to the square described upon its height;" also, "that a belt as broad as the base of the Great Pyramid, passing round the earth, would contain one thousand millions of square feet." On his own account, he continues: —

"The height of the pyramid, casing inclusive, from base to apex, is 1-270,000th of the earth's circumference. Taking the equatorial circumference as unity, the

---

\* 24 barley-corns or 32 wheat-corns = 1 pennyweight; 20 pennyweights = 1 oz.; 12 oz. = 1 lb.

error of this aliquot is one part in 736 ; but, if the polar be assumed, it is only one part in 3,506, — the former error in defect, the latter in excess. So there exists somewhere a diametral section whose circumference is exactly 270,000 times the height of the Great Pyramid. Though not a meridian, it is not very remote from one."

We believe we have indicated all the salient points of this book, — certainly all those of interest.

C. H. D.

SINCE the time of Dr. Arnold, the history of Rome has been less studied in England than that of Greece, or at least the study has produced less fruits. Even to this day, Arnold's work continues, on the whole, the best for the ground it covers ; and Liddell's — the best for the whole period of the republic — is only a brief compend, constructed from partial materials. For no one ventures to repeat what Arnold did, — transplant the ripest results of German scholarship into English soil, and recast them in a shape better adapted to the needs of the English mind. They seem hardly to know any authority later than Niebuhr, and to cling superstitiously to theories of his which have long since been exploded. With all these defects, Liddell's is a very readable and, in the main, accurate work, — a very serviceable abridgment of Roman history.

The last two or three years have shown a greater activity in this field ; and, besides Merivale's great work, which has already been noticed at length in these pages, we are glad to announce a new edition of his earlier work, which serves in some degree as an introduction to the later and larger one.\* It is not strictly an introduction to it ; for it covers much of the same ground, and, indeed, many pages in the larger work are taken almost verbally from this. On the other hand, it is not a mere abridgment, even of the period embraced by both works ; for on some points this work is fuller than the other. Written independently, as it was, and for the general reader rather than the student, it is, no doubt, better suited to those who wish only to get the leading, essential facts of the great historical subject it treats of, in all its philosophical bearings.

W. F. A.

MR. UPHAM'S monograph on the witchcraft delusion of 1692 † is

\* *The Fall of the Roman Republic ; a Short History of the Last Century of the Commonwealth.* By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. London : Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1865. 12mo, pp. 564.

† *Salem Witchcraft ; with an Account of Salem Village, and a History of Opinions on Witchcraft and Kindred Subjects.* By CHARLES W. UPHAM. Boston : Wiggin & Lunt, 1867. 2 vols. post 8vo, pp. xl. and 469, 553.



one of the most thorough, elaborate, and satisfactory works of the kind ever written. There is no part of the subject which he has not studied in an exhaustive manner, and no collateral source of information which he has not carefully explored. No one who had not spent years in the investigation, and brought to the task special aptitudes for the work, could have produced two volumes on such a subject, in which it is scarcely possible for the most searching criticism to point out a single omission or misstatement or mark of carelessness, and which literally leave nothing to be desired in respect of breadth of view, minuteness of detail, or candor of statement. Nearly an entire generation has passed away since Mr. Upham's "*Lectures on Witchcraft*" were first given to the public; and the work has long been out of print, though it has always stood high in the public estimation. In reverting, after the lapse of so many years, to a subject which he had thus made his own, he has not contented himself with reproducing his earlier work; but he has retraced every step trodden before, and has extended his inquiries into new fields, so that scarcely any part of his former work can be discovered in his new volumes.

He has divided his work into three parts of unequal length, but of nearly equal merit. The first is devoted to a preliminary sketch of the history of Salem Village, and to an account of the various families living there, and of the state of society among them previous to the witchcraft prosecutions. This part fills more than two-thirds of the first volume, and is not surpassed by any similar sketch which we have found in any of our local histories. It is a monument of the unwearied diligence and perseverance of the author, and a needed introduction to the narrative which follows.

The second part, which covers the remaining pages of the first volume, is a scarcely less thorough and satisfactory history of opinions on the general subject of witchcraft, from the earliest times to the close of the seventeenth century, with the special design of illustrating the origin and character of the superstitions commonly accredited in New England in the period to which his work relates. In this part of his inquiry, Mr. Upham traverses ground not unfamiliar to cultivated persons: but he does not exhibit less breadth and minuteness of research; and he brings to light many details which will be new to the larger proportion of his readers.

The second volume is mainly devoted to a full and circumstantial history of the delusion, from the first sitting of the circle of "afflicted

girls," through the preliminary examinations in the village and the trials in Salem, to the final termination of this terrible story in the release of those prisoners, who, more fortunate than the others, had escaped the first fury of the storm. Every part of the narrative is illustrated and strengthened by citations from the original and unpublished documents; and, through Mr. Upham's unrivalled familiarity with the actors and the localities, every incident is described so vividly, and yet so minutely, that the reader finds it difficult to persuade himself that he is not in the presence of an eye-witness. At the same time, our author never identifies himself with the contemporary quarrels and prejudices, but uniformly preserves his candor and impartiality. The narrative is followed by a general survey of the subject, and by some judicious and well-considered observations on the characteristics of the delusion, on the motives which led so many persons to confess that they were witches, on the testimony of the witnesses, and on the general topic of intercourse with spirits at that time and in our own age.

A Supplement considers and answers several of the questions which must occur to every reader, and embodies much information in regard to the subsequent history of the prominent actors, the contemporaneous and more recent opinions on the subject of the prosecutions, and other kindred topics; and in the Appendix are several illustrative documents.

We have written of Mr. Upham's labors in terms of warmer praise than we are accustomed to use; but the rare merits of his work fully justify the highest commendation of its thoroughness, its impartiality, and its interest. There are, however, a few criticisms in respect to the mechanical part of the work which must not be omitted. The convenience of the reader would have been much promoted if the several parts had been broken up into chapters; if an analytical table of contents had been prefixed to each volume; and if the Index had been placed at the end of the second volume. The occasional use of the direct, personal form of address, which was originally adopted in the "Lectures," is also a defect in the literary execution. C. C. S.

NEWS has just come of the death of the most eminent of German philologists, August Boeckh. Although his season of productive activity was over, and he had nearly reached the ripe age of eighty, his death is none the less a loss to classical scholarship, even more by the influence of his refined tone and high aims in investigation

and discussion, than by the instruction that he had, until very lately, continued to give in the University. German scholars are not famed for comity and good temper in debate, and will wrangle over a Greek particle or a new emendation with the true fervor of theologians; but Boeckh has been habitually as courteous in argument as earnest and eloquent. His features and manners expressed a nobility and kindness of nature which were thoroughly characteristic of him, and made him one of the best loved as well as most honored of his class.

Boeckh's fame is founded upon services of a deeper and more enduring nature than even the books he wrote and the discoveries he made. He was founder of a school of philology, which has carried with it most of the younger scholars of the day in Germany, and which ought before now to have redeemed German philology from the bad name of "Dryasdust." The great impulse given by Wolf to verbal criticism, with its priceless results in the way of restoring the texts of ancient authors, had at the same time directed the energies of that generation chiefly to this work. It was indispensable that it should be so. Without correct texts of the classic writers, no certain or valuable results could be derived from them. But this work, which, after all, was only a preparation for the real study and interpretation of antiquity, came to be pursued as if it were itself an end. Hence the dry and uninspiring school of which we have all heard enough.

Boeckh's first labor was in that line, which was then most energetically pursued; and we owe to him the restoration of the text of Pindar. But, having thus broken ground in the study of antiquity, he was not long in making his way to that field to which he felt most strongly attracted, — the restoration, not merely of the words of books, but of the life of the nations themselves. We owe to him an accurate and nearly complete picture of the political life of Athens, in the "*Staatshaushaltung der Athener*," and other works which followed. Once the way pointed out, other scholars followed it, according to their bent. The work of textual criticism had not by any means been completed, — indeed, it is far from completed even now; and those lovers of Homer, Æschylus, Demosthenes, and Plautus, who are so fond of laughing at the painstaking labors of the Germans, would perhaps be astonished to learn how much of their pleasure they owe to men like Gottfried, Hermann, Lachmann, Bekker, and Ritschl. But the school of Boeckh has become the prevailing one; the men of antiquity and their thoughts are studied rather than their mere words; and every year is making the life of the Greeks

and Romans, in all its relations, — political, religious, literary, domestic, — more easily and better understood by our generation. No doubt this school would have come into existence even if its founder had never lived. Otfried Müller would have established it if Boeckh had not. But we none the less owe thanks for the profound scholarship, the clear judgment, the liberal thought, and the long life devoted to the investigation of truth, of August Boeckh. W. F. A.

---

NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

The Curate's Discipline. A Novel. By Mrs. Eiloart. 8vo, pp. 159.

Birds of Prey. A Novel. By M. E. Braddon. 8vo, pp. 157.

Engineers' and Mechanics' Pocket-Book. Containing Weights and Measures, Rules of Arithmetic, Weights of Materials, Latitude and Longitude, Cables and Anchors, Specific Gravities, Squares, Cubes, Roots, &c.; Mensuration of Surfaces and Solids, Trigonometry, Mechanics, Friction, Aerostatics, Hydraulics and Hydrodynamics, Dynamics, Gravitation, Animal Strength, Steam and the Steam-Engine, &c., &c. By Charles H. Haswell, Civil and Marine Engineer. Pocket-book form. pp. 663.

Called to Account. A Novel. By Miss Annie Thomas. 8vo, pp. 152.

The Early Years of His Royal Highness the Prince-Consort. Compiled under the direction of Her Majesty the Queen, by Lieutenant-General the Hon. C. Grey. 12mo, pp. 371. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Caste. A Novel. By the author of "Mr. Arle." 8vo, pp. 136.

Manual of Physical Exercises. Comprising Gymnastics, Rowing, Skating, Fencing, Cricket, Calisthenics, Sailing, Swimming, Sparring, Base Ball, together with Rules for Training, and Sanitary Suggestions. By William Wood, Instructor in Physical Education. With 125 illustrations. 12mo, pp. 316. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Teetotalism, as a Rule of Duty, unknown to the Bible, and condemned by Christian Ethics. By D. R. Thomason. With a Commendatory Letter by Howard Crosby, D.D. pp. 136. New York: Richardson & Company.

Reply to Dr. Marsh on Teetotalism. By D. R. Thomason. Including a letter from Howard Crosby, D.D. pp. 30. New York: Richardson & Company.

History of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States of America. By Abel Stevens. Vols. iii., iv. pp. 510, 522.

Popular Amusements: an Appeal to Methodists in Regard to the Evils of Card-playing, Billiards, Dancing, Theatre-going, &c. By Hiram Mattison. pp. 96. New York: Carlton & Porter.

A Brief Account of his Ministry, given in a Discourse preached in the Church of the Messiah in Syracuse, N.Y., Sept. 15, 1867. By Samuel J. May. pp. 52. Syracuse: Masters & Lee.

St. Ignatius and the Society of Jesus: their Influence on Civilization and Christianity. A Sermon. By Rev. G. F. Haskins. pp. 30. Boston: Bernard Corr.



# INDEX

## TO THE CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

NEW SERIES, VOL. IV.

JULY TO NOVEMBER, 1867.

- Basis and Superstructure (Address by Rev. O. Dewey, D.D.), 137-157 — Foundation of religion in human nature, 139 — direct intuitions, 141 — Supreme Nature, 144 — breadth of Christian influence, 146 — Christian ministry, 14 — decay of controversy, 149 — rationalism, 150 — Church ordinances, 153.
- Boeckh, his death and character, 388.
- Bulfinch, S. G., *Manual of Evidences*, 252.
- Bunsen's Egypt, 305-335 — Study of Egyptian antiquities, 306 — Bunsen's critics, 308 — recent explorations, 310 — Life of Bunsen, 313 — Work on Egypt, 315 — chronological system, 317 — the Egyptian year, 319 — Sothiac period, 321 — the Dynasties, 323 — chronological outline, 324, 327 — general results, 326 — early emigrations, 329 — Ethiopia, 330 — epochs, 332.
- Cambridge Divinity School, 220-246 — charges, 222 — what is implied, 224 — rationalism of the day, 225 — character of its radicalism, 227 — Christian theism, 229 — proposed substitute: Boston plan, 230 — new school in Cambridge, 232 — office of a theological school, 235 — philosophy of the day, 236 — uses of a School, 238 — theology as part of a university course, 243 — plans discussed, 244.
- Church of England, its hold on the attachment of its members, 1-4 — how it should be regarded and improved, 5-7.
- Cobbe, F. P., 265-286 — her life, 266 Cities of the Past, 272 — Broken Lights, 276 — Intuitive Morality, 279 — Religious Duty, 282 — person and character, 285.
- Colenso, Bishop, 1-15 — his early life, 8 — colonial bishopric, 9 — his Biblical inquiries, 11; person and character, 13 — ecclesiastical trial, 14.
- Colleges (American), 46-62 — course of study, 47 — post-graduate course, 50 — study of Latin, 51-54 — parallel courses of study, 55 — elective studies, 56 — proposed abolition of the Freshman year, 59 — preparatory course, 60.
- Collyer, R., *Nature and Life*, 246.
- Cranbook, James, *Sermons*, 382.
- Curtis on Inspiration, 294-304.
- Dall, Mrs., *The College, Market, and Court*, 258.
- Dante, Longfellow's Translation, 251.
- D'Azeglio and the Unity of Italy, 187-208 — his life, 191 — literary career, 192. — political life, 197 — military service, 201 — character as a statesman, 215.
- Eastern Question in politics, 254.

- Elliott's Holy Land, 250.  
 Fontanès, Study of Lessing, 380.  
 Gannett's Discourse before the Alumni of the Cambridge Divinity School, 220.  
 Inspiration, Curtis on, 294-304 — J. F. Clarke's statement, 299.  
 Italy, sentiment of unity in, 188 — reforms, 197.  
 Jesus as Prophet and Messiah, 79-99 — his prophetic consciousness, 81 — Messianism, 83 — how far colored by Evangelists, 86 — theory of accommodation, 87 — plan of his ministry, 90 — outline of his public course, 92 — sufferings and death, 96.  
 Jewish and Christian Charity, 335-342.  
 Laengin, Moral Development of Jesus, 129.  
 Lessing, Fontanès on, 380.  
 Liber Librorum, 133.  
 Liberal Ministry, 99-111 — criticism of Shedd's Homiletics, 100-106 — a written revelation, 100 — authority of Scripture, 103 — morality and mercy, 105 — the Christian reality, 107 — speculative disbelief and religious life, 108 — teaching of theology, 110.  
 Longfellow's Dante, 261.  
 Merivale's Fall of the Roman Republic, 388.  
 Mignet as an Historian, 32-46.  
 Mill, J. S., Inaugural Address, 48, 62.  
 Monastic Orders, Services of, 63-78 — after the fall of the empire, 65 — missions, 66, 69 — modern industry, 67 — preservation of Christian doctrine, 70 — literary services, 72 — preaching, 73 — character, 74 — cultivation of equality, 75 — sacred literature, 76.  
 Noves's Translation of the Hebrew Prophets, 15-31 — its established reputation, 17 — compared with DeWette, 18 — with Common Version, 19 — Book of Daniel, 22 — office of prophet, 24, 81 — inspiration, 25 — Messianic prophecy, 26 — prophetic vision, 29 — argument for Christianity, 93 — Hebrew Poets, 175-186 — Job, 176 — Ecclesiastes, 177 — Psalms, 178 — poetic form, 181 — rhythm and accent, 184.  
 Prophetic office, 24-81.  
 Quincy, Josiah, Life, by Edmund Quincy, 366.  
 Revolutionary Period, Springer's History of, 157-175 — the French monarchy, 158 — taxation and distress, 162; the philosophers, 165 — industrial revolution, 168 — revolution of 1830, 170 — socialism, 172.  
 Shedd, W. T. G., Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, 99-106.  
 Spinoza, recent studies of, 374.  
 Stallard on Jewish and Christian charities, 257-335.  
 State Charities of Massachusetts, 112-116.  
 Stobbe, Jews of Middle Age, 252.  
 Sunday Question and its Witnesses, 208-220.  
 Taylor on the Great Pyramid, 383.  
 Upham's Salem Witchcraft, 386.  
 Westborough Reform School, 116-129 — its early history, 116 — question of economy, 119 — the Connecticut School, 122 — sectarian jealousy, 124 — moral discipline, 125.  
 Woman in Public Life, 342.  
 Youmans on Modern Culture, 286-294 — influence of science, 289 — study of literature and classics, 291.

